

SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE LATE MEDIEVAL MYSTICS*

RAY C. PETRY
Duke University

Charges of social irresponsibility have frequently been hurled against the medieval mystics, in their own day as in our yet more activist age.¹ Mysticism and monasticism, to whose discipline the mystics owed much, have often been condemned for selfish withdrawal from public obligation. A major cause of this unjustifiable indictment is doubtless traceable to a predominant area of ignorance within the Western World. This is the growing unawareness of the balance maintained in the Christian tradition between contemplative worship of the Divine and active service of the human.²

Several Christian Fathers exercised an influence upon speculative and affective spirituality out of all proportion to their number. Virtually every one was a mystic, or a religious, or both. St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430), especially, raised issues representative throughout later mystical thought. He declared for the rightful precedence of God's worship while, at the same time, insisting upon a proper service of man's need. The Church, he points out, knows two lives, both revealed and beloved of God. One is in faith, the other by sight; one is of earthly pilgrimage, the other that of the *patria*; one is in labor, the other in rest; the one is a journeying, the other an abiding at home; one knows a state that is good but still sorrowful, the other comprehends that which is better and in joyful beatitude; one is the active, the other the contemplative life. The first reaches its conclusion with the ending of this life; the second is completed only after the end of this world; but, thereafter, knows no end.³

Jacob's wives, Leah and Rachel, become, for Augustine, elaborately allegorized symbols of action and contemplation. Jacob found it necessary to accept Leah first if he would come to the embraces of Rachel. Unloved for herself Leah might be, but she gave Jacob the children not forthcoming from Rachel's barrenness. Most men would gladly avoid the suffering and the exhaustion of the active life and enter immediately upon the freedom and delights of contemplative wisdom. But mortal man, well educated by hard realities, must first accept the wearing life of good works before he can claim the joy of con-

*Presidential address read in New York City, December 28, 1951.

templating the full truth. The ardor with which Jacob burns for Rachel must first be disciplined by fruitful householding with Leah. Rachel herself prefers on occasion to lend her husband to her sister rather than have no issue of her own. Men capable of bearing the burdens of the multitude and the government of the Church simply cannot be allowed to luxuriate in private contemplation. If the children of Holy Church are to be born and nourished, if her saving mysteries are to be dispensed and the Gospel preached to benighted wanderers—then the love of knowledge and the right of individual withdrawal must be renounced for the active work of the Church in service to the common good.⁴

In complimenting Mary for having chosen the better part of contemplation, Christ was by no means blaming Martha for her useful, if lesser, ministry in the active life. The two lives symbolized by Martha and Mary are both innocent and pleasing to God. Martha prefigures the present, Mary the future. Martha's activity represents what we are; Mary's repose that which we hope to be. Let us sanctify the active life of Martha to possess fully the contemplative repose of Mary. For Mary only signified the contemplative priority; she had not yet laid hold on it securely.⁵

To this double way, Augustine, on occasion, adds a third; that is, the mixed or composite.⁶ A man in true faith and piety may choose any of these and be right with God. "No man [however] has a right to lead such a life of contemplation as to forget in his own ease the service due to his neighbor; nor has any man a right to be so immersed in active life as to neglect the contemplation of God." One may rightfully yearn for the leisured contemplation of truth and prosecute it—so long, at least, as love does not lay upon him the requisite business of going to others' assistance. Yet, even in the midst of responding to human necessity, one is not thereby required to surrender all the sweets of contemplation; "for were these to be withdrawn, the burden might prove more than we could bear."⁷

What, then, is the reaction of the late medieval mystics to such an early, classic expression of the Christian equilibrium between active and contemplative?⁸ What, further, are the specific charges against such mystics and the historical arguments in defense of their attitude to social responsibility?

The assault launched is variously supported. Actually, however, it resolves itself into three constituent charges to which three sets of historical evidence may be entered in defense. The first charge is that the mystic habitually worshipped God in selfish contemplation, isolated from the claims of humanitarian service; or at least with a serious imbalance of the contemplative prejudicial to the active. In defense, history gives evidence that the mystic sought to reestablish the Christian equilibrium of primary worship to God and secondary service to man.

The second charge is that the mystic deprecated, when he did not actually repudiate, the disciplinary fellowship of the Church, the primacy of the hierarchy, and the communion of sacramental life. All of this he is supposed to have done by way of seeking immediate subjective commerce with Deity to the detriment of the corporate Church. To this history replies that, with very few exceptions, the mystic subordinated himself to Church, hierarchy, and sacraments as to the socializing agents of eternal solidarity in the temporal world. Third, it is implied, when not asserted, that the mystic exhausted himself in private devotion and shirked public, social responsibility to the world that nurtured him. Historically it may be demonstrated that the mystic accepted specific commissions from the ecclesiastical community for service to world society.

This paper studies the historical evidences regarding these three issues from representative mystics of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. Franciscans, Dominicans, hermits, canons, and non-religious, that is, secular clergy, are selected. Spanish, German, English, and Flemish contemplatives are analyzed.

The Spanish Franciscan Raymond Lull (1235-1315, 16) clearly evidenced worshipful contemplation welded to humanitarian action. The beautiful prayer with which he apostrophizes the Divine unity in his little book on the *Art of Contemplation* invokes God thus: "'True is it, O Lord God, that there is no other God save Thyself alone. To Thee alone I offer and present myself, that I may serve Thee . . . Humble am I indeed if I humble myself to Thee. Lord am I, if I am Thine alone . . . Whatsoever may become of me, let it be all to one end, to wit, Thy praise, honour and glory. Thee alone do I fear, from Thee alone is my strength, for Thee I weep, for Thee I burn with love, and none other Lord will I have, save Thee only.'"⁹ Allison Peers rightly insists upon our associating with this contemplative testimony the sentiment of missionary activity. This, too, comes from the little *Art of Contemplation* and swings into action throughout the Lullian career of self-abnegating, universalizing service: "'Wherefore . . . to Thee, O Love, O Virtue, O Truth, I bind and submit myself all the days of my life, that I may honour Thy graces, and proclaim to unbelievers, and to Christians who have lost their devotion, the truth of Thy Virtue and Thy Truth and Thy Love.'"¹⁰

In his *Book of the Lover and the Beloved*, the Lover himself describes the trajectory of love: "'It began in the glory of my Beloved; and from that beginning I was led to love my neighbour even as myself . . .'"¹¹ Naturally it was the Beloved whom the Lover willed "to comprehend, to contemplate, praise and preach."¹² What is religion, after all, says this book, but contemplation and the renunciation of the whole world? Nothing more, say his three hundred books and his life,

than the active ministry in Christ's name, to those for whom Christ died. Speaking autobiographically five years before his death, Lull tells how he, whom many men stigmatize as a "phantasticus," freely gave up family and worldly position. So that God might be honored, the public good served, and holy faith exalted, he renounced everything, learned Arabic, evangelized the Saracen, and underwent repeated captivities and abuse. For forty-five years since, he has labored to move the heads of the church and Christian princes for the public good. Now, old and poverty-stricken, he proposes to persevere as before, unto death itself, the Lord being willing.¹³

At the outset of his career, he had written the voluminous *Book of Contemplation in God*, perhaps the major work of Lullian mysticism. Here his impassioned lyricism over the contemplative grandeurs of the heavenly world throbs on into ineffable heartbreak over infidel hosts who go to their doom for want of Christian action.¹⁴ In his last book he will record the irony of his being asked to supplicate papal curia and Christian princes for the implementation of his books and plans. How often he had done just that—and with what meager results! Now, if he may be excused, he will do what he can, at the last, to bury his own melancholy and the memory of the Church's lost opportunities in one final, self-immolating mission to the heathen.¹⁵ Two of his worst fears will, as we know, prove groundless: his dread of never finishing a systematic exposition of the contemplative life and his phobia over dying naturally and inactively in bed.

From the day when he relinquished a life of wealth and ease to that hour when he seized the martyr's corona, he had never faltered. He had delighted to contemplate God, honor his church and clergy, proclaim the mercies of divine redemptiveness alive in the sacraments, and instruct both priests and people in the role of the Church's evangelizing faith. Whether in his gracious booklet on contemplation and his ponderous works on the same theme or in his *Tree of Knowledge*, he inculcates love of that hierarchical ordering on earth that would follow the heavenly.¹⁶ He labors to help the less-informed clergy in the Catholic instruction of their flocks, to make available pedagogic devices for all ages of children and adults, to forearm even lay-merchants traveling in foreign lands with a positive confession of faith adequate to the demolition of infidel tenets.¹⁷ He recalls in his *Book of the Lover* that he was sent by his "Beloved to Christian princes and to unbelievers, to teach them by his *Art* and his *Elements* to know and love his Beloved."¹⁸

Almost to the very last, Lull went to popes, councils, and university scholars. He brought to them his plans for making church and sacraments the spiritually saving, socially redemptive fact that his contemplative vision knew them, potentially, to be. Religious orders must be spiritually renovated and altered, whether for internal reform or co-

military crusading. The hierarchy must be recalled to its responsibility for galvanizing the faithful against the unfaithful; through force of arms to be sure, but, more productively, through loving evangelization of the heathen in their own tongues.

Lull accepted and expanded beyond easy belief the ecclesiastical commission for service to the world order. He wrote a library of books, missionized intensively, and propagandized curia, councils, and princes, endlessly. From 1294 to 1314, especially, he stressed the need for centers of study devoted to Eastern languages; for institutes of missions; for a hierarchy fully enrolled in the service of Christ, at home and abroad; for tax levies to support the study of infidel tongues and armed crusaders; for a propaganda "Voice of Christendom" to convert heathen, who would then convert other heathen; for university faculties to examine his syllabi, to join in eradicating Averroism, to adopt and adapt his *Grand Art*, whether for syllogizing the refutation of the Saracens or curing the aches of body, mind and soul.¹⁹ He did and said things both foolish and wise. Interspersed with his contemplative preoccupations were his active journeyings, his stubborn pamphleteering and stupendous writing, his untold hardships, and his repeated missionary thrusts. Such a great harvest was over-ripe. Such a dearth of laborers was available. But he had been sent by his Beloved. Whatever princes or prelates might do, he would go again into the vineyard of the Lord's opportunity. He died late in 1315 or early in 1316. He had loved the world—but "for its artificer's sake."²⁰

The Dominican mystics, like their Franciscan brethren, exemplified a high degree of social responsiveness. Meister Eckhart (c. 1260-1328) properly ranks the life of contemplation above that of action. But this should result in no diminution of social concern. Mary's better part did not neutralize the usefulness of Martha's service to Christ and his disciples. Thomas Aquinas knows that, from one viewpoint at least, "the active life is better than the contemplative, for in it one pours out the love he has received in contemplation. Yet it is all one; for what we implant in the soil of contemplation we shall reap in the harvest of action and thus the purpose of contemplation is achieved . . . In contemplation, you serve only yourself. In good works, you serve many people." Christ's admonition to let one's light shine has a special, demanding pertinence for those who prefer to enshrine contemplation at the expense of action.²¹

Each man is under the constant necessity of having God in and with him everywhere, on the streets and among people, just as much as in church, a desert place, or a cell. Not that there are no priorities attached to the stated places and seasons of the Church's worship. But, as God is to be appropriated in church or closet, so he is to be taken with us among the crowds and turmoils of the alien world. Obviously, the in-

ner heart and mind, not some contemplative stereotype, lead to the laying hold on God. Inner solitude there must be, with God fixed clearly on mind and heart, but world flight and eremitic holiness are not finally, enough.²²

Eckhart's essential loyalty to the Church and her saving graces has only to be understood sympathetically to be appreciated correctly. The positive intent of his fundamentally orthodox persuasions does not wholly exculpate him from the unfortunate consequences of his rasher linguistic colorations. A minute examination of both the condemnatory process and his own defense finds one agreeing with later researchers, however, that here is no heretical insistence on the right of private choice in doctrine; nor is there real evidence of his derogating any constituted hierarchy or clearly established tenet. That Eckhart prizes the right of helping decide the intent of his own heart where words are in themselves inadequate to a judgment upon him is clearly apparent. Had he been content to say nothing that could lend itself to the misunderstanding of uninspired verbalists, or only those things innocuously conducive to spiritual somnolence, perhaps he would not have been suspect. He would have been considerably less than Eckhart, however. Certainly, he would have compromised much that was dear to his heart as a preacher; much that came from his inner being to the word-transcending pulsations of the popular spirit. It is obvious, furthermore, that Eckhart as a distinguished teacher preferred—yes even enjoyed—taking some long chances in the communication of his inner resources to the secret fastnesses of his disciples' hearts. If he had only been sufficiently stupid or wearisomely dull, how impassively harmless he might have been in his effect, both on people and hierarchy.²³

The *Talks of Instruction* and well authenticated sermons, for their part, cast no aspersions upon the Church's community of salvation. Eckhart pleads, not that the Church's sacraments be bypassed, but that they be participated in with holy fervor by those inwardly and outwardly disciplined in preparation for them; moreover, that the love of Christ in holy communion be made to glow rather than become dulled by such frequency of partaking as is best suited to the individual soul. One need not quake in fear before the sacrament if it be allowed to mediate the purifying and uniting graces of the Lord's Body and Blood. Indeed, an intimate union, ineffably sweet, will result if one's faith be deeply rooted and the knowledge of how God's grace is mediated by inner and outer cultivation be honestly sought. Receiving the Lord's Body and Blood, thus, will not be a matter of physical ingestion, only, but of inner responsiveness from the heart, as well. And this inner communion may be experienced one hundred times a day or night, sick or well. But such intromission must be prepared for by a deep intent of the heart and a careful disciplining of the self not to be undertaken lightly. Here, then, is

no repudiation of ecclesiastical rites or regularly commissioned functionaries; only a prayer that the inner reality be heightened by the outward observance.²⁴

In last analysis, Meister Eckhart's life as servant of his order, obedient if colorful son of the Church, and inspiring minister of countless people to whom he preached and among whom he lived, is as brightly uncompromised as his status in "official theology" is sometimes beclouded. A fragment attributed to him is unerringly true to his heart's intent; just as his life of contemplation was faithfully reflected in action. "No person in this life may reach the point at which he can be excused from outward service. Even if he is given to a life of contemplation, still he cannot refrain from going out and taking an active part in life . . . I say that the contemplative person should indeed avoid even the thought of deeds to be done during the period of his contemplation, but afterwards he should get busy . . ."²⁵

John Tauler (c. 1294-1361) shares many of these sentiments with Eckhart. His sermon on the Mystical Body stresses the interdependence of contemplative and active vocations within the Church. Where the head is Christ, and the eyes are learned doctors and teachers, humbler Christians have duties and stations no less vital to the common life. All honorable occupations are of God and ought to be dutifully prosecuted. Were he not a priest and a religious, the preacher would be happy to make shoes or otherwise serve with his hands. A man laboring for God has no cause for unrest. Martha was rebuked, not for her laudable deeds, but for her undue solicitude. Whether called by the Holy Spirit to the repose of contemplation or the movement of action, one should follow obediently this sacred impulsion. Contemplative claims require the validation of inner and outer excuses of religion, with active ministry to the needs of the humblest. A farmer threshing out grain is suddenly rapt in an ecstasy, with his flail upraised. Only an angel from heaven can save him from the falling implement. So it is. None wants to thresh. Each wants to be caught up in a trance. All would be eyes to the body. Many are enamored of contemplation with little stomach for action. A farm laborer is about ready, after forty years, to give up his ploughing for more tranquil and churchly vocation. The Lord soon sets him straight. "Win your bread in the sweat of your brow," he says, "and in that service you will sufficiently honor my precious shed blood." Nonetheless, in the time of day or night and in the manner most appropriate to his spiritual condition, every one should retire into his inner abode; praying as God leads him to do. Spiritual systems and intensive short-cuts that call for no exterior applications are the deceitful contrivances of untrustworthy spiritual guides. Let God truly speak in quiet, within, and man will become active, without, under the working of his spirit.²⁶

Tauler's loyalty to the hierarchy and his love of the sacraments are not open to question. Bad priests are deprecated in pungent phrase. They may lead men astray rather than help them, may anger God more than they conciliate him. Nevertheless, insofar as the priesthood performs the holy office under the Church's commission and thus discharges its function sacramentally, it serves uniquely and indispensably. True, in spiritual wise, there is an offering that a woman can make as well as a man, at any season and under any circumstance consonant with genuinely spiritual receptiveness. As in Eckhart, however, this is no substitute for the Church's sacraments; only a mounting spiritual impulse built on what they provide.²⁷

Tauler has left us an extended series of well-authenticated sermons on the Sacrament of the Altar.²⁸ Doubt of his Catholic veneration for the holy mysteries can scarcely persist after the reading of these testimonies. Tauler's sermon on I Peter 3:8 is especially instructive because it scrutinizes external prayer, offices, and rites with a clear nod in the direction of interior cultivation. Nevertheless, this is no repudiation of hierarchical function and external sacraments—only a call to the fuller realization of what the sacraments themselves involve beyond the sheer externality of cult.²⁹

Actually, a loving regard for all men is most truly forthcoming from the unity of a proper hierarchy serving the mystical body. Such is the service of enemy as well as friend, beyond the sea or near at hand. It is the solidarity of an ecclesiastical hierarchy imitating the celestial one that leads church, religious orders, and all Christian men to a wider social ministry. Thus, two of his sermons, now readily accessible, constitute a tribute to the interior spirit doing the work of church and world. They observe the dignity of all hierarchs; bring sacraments, rites, and observances into redemptive focus; and give the pledge of loving, obedient service to men and women of Holy Church, religious orders, and all humanity, good and bad, everywhere—so long as the world shall last.³⁰

Richard Rolle of Hampole (c. 1290-1349) recognizes both the active and the contemplative life, but gives an indisputable primacy to the latter.³¹ Any argument must fail that declares the active "meedfuller because of the many deeds and preachings that it does." To be sure, "there are many active better than some contemplative; but the best contemplative are higher than the best active." Outward work done makes no man holier, though it does carry its sure, if accidental, reward of joy in the thing wrought. Contemplation in this life, as well as in that to come, bears sweetness, joy, fervor, and fruitage, however, that the active cannot possibly match.

Obviously, there is a legitimate place for actives, wholly secondary though it be. Solomon's temple has pillars of silver, that is "the strong upbearers and the good governors of holy kirk." Contemplatives, how-

ever, constitute "the gold resting place," on which Christ leans his head.

Manifestly, God has "foreordained his chosen to fulfil divers services." No man is expected to do more than dignify properly the place in which he is set, with the grace suitable to his gift. Some give alms from righteously won goods. Others defend truth to the death. Yet others preach, with word or pen. Some "suffer for God great penance and wretchedness in this life; others, by the gift of contemplation, are only busy to God and set themselves straitly to love Christ."

Rolle entertains a highly theoretical possibility concerning the mixed life. To combine the active and the contemplative so as to "fulfil bodily service, and nevertheless feel the heavenly sound in himself, and be melted in singing into the joy of heavenly love" would be as great an experience as it is an unlikely one.³²

The most fully dedicated contemplative will not descend to the active; unless, of course, he be forced to "take governance of Christians." This exigency need hardly arise, however, as there are always contemplatives available for such work who are "less imbued with heat of love." This uncompromising stand of Rolle's is not, however, to be interpreted as sheer derogation of those called to an active part in the world's work; whether these be less gifted contemplatives or even more obviously active folk.³³ One who reads the *Fire of Love*, *The Mending of Life*, *The Penitential Psalms*, *The Form of Living*, and the *Lyrics* must surely grant to Rolle a specialized interpretation of the unitive life at its fullest. Yet, Rolle's own sensitivity to the needs of those who called upon him proclaims a man truly active in the work of the world. So, also, does the *Life* ascribed to him in the *Office* prepared in anticipation of his feast.³⁴ There are good reasons for defending the genuineness of his book, *Our Daily Work*.³⁵ Not only there, however, but in his multiple preachings with "word and pen" are the exemplary demonstrations that "love cannot be lazy."³⁶

That Rolle may have felt the pinch of unsympathetic hierarchs seems more than probable, from chance references.³⁷ Yet there is no doubt of his essential loyalty to prelates and his unalterable love for Christ, His Mother, and His Holy Church. In spite of his inflexible language, Rolle was a contemplative who did come down to the active world, with the bread of the Church offered to hungry men.

The Cloud of Unknowing (fourteenth century) draws not only upon Pseudo-Dionysian prototypes but, in addition, upon the whole sweep of Patristic leaders.³⁸ The *Cloud* stakes out the claim of contemplation beyond any that the active can lodge. The highest contemplative will not meddle with the active life—at least in its more overt expressions. Yet, as is quickly apparent, this is more by way of a defense against attackers of contemplatives, as such, than a refusal to bless the

active scene.³⁹ There are occasions when the active life is best helped by the full reservoirs of the contemplative. Some eight chapters develop the Augustinian commentary on Mary and Martha.⁴⁰ The two lives here represented—both good, but one higher than the other—do co-participate to a degree, each in the other. Active life has two degrees: a higher and a lower. Contemplation has two degrees: a lower and a higher. Actually, the “part that is the higher part of active life, that same part is the lower part of contemplative life. So that a man may not be fully active, except he be in part contemplative; nor yet fully contemplative (as it may be here), except he be in part active.” The active life of Martha begins and ends on earth. The contemplative vocation of Mary shall last without end.⁴¹

However much the world's Marthas may continue to complain of the Marys, contemplatives will not be estopped by the abuse of actives.⁴² Actually, the true contemplative knows that he has a boon to offer humanity that must start as a preoccupation with Divinity. Such a contemplative love of God for himself alone, above all creatures, carries an ineluctable charity to one's “even-Christian.” “A perfect worker hath no special regard unto any man by himself, whether he be kin or stranger, friend or foe. For all men seem alike kin unto him, and no man stranger.”⁴³

The churchly love and devotion of this author is beyond asking. He knew well the community of Christ that drew from the heavenly city the sustenance it offered to the earthly. Dom McCann merely states a fact when he says that this book would “claim for this high life of contemplation a great social efficacy, and a more perfect charity than is contained in the busy activity of others.”⁴⁴

John Ruysbroeck (1293-1381) treats of mystical experience in terms of three unities, each facilitated through one of three ways.⁴⁵ The lower, corporeal unity, with its practice of external works, goes the way of the active life. The spiritual unity, expressing itself by the theological virtues and the imitation of Jesus Christ, follows in the way of the interior life. The sublime unity, which makes us to repose in God above all thought or intention, is the supernatural life with its end in contemplation. The active life, claiming virtuous men of God, will permit a foretaste of the divine union—the union of intermediary or with means. The interior life brings God and creature together in a union without intermediary or means. In the contemplative life there is consummated a union without distinction or differences; one such as Christ spoke of in his consecratory prayer. This is a time of ecstasy followed by knowledge, love, and jubilation. Still, it is no sheerly passive or quietist state. Between the writing of *The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage* and that of the *Sparkling Stone*, Ruysbroeck has come to guard ever more closely against pantheistic encroachments and heretical “passivism.”

More and more he emphasizes "practical life." Those who multiply works, however, and lose themselves therein, belong in the same category with people who isolate themselves in contemplative repose, away from practical demands.⁴⁶

Invoking the spiritual law of aspiration and expiration, God draws us near to himself—beyond any holding back; but, after this, God's Holy Spirit breathes us out again, for the practice of love and good works. As in nature, so, here, too—we exhale the old and inhale the fresh air. One enters inactive joys; then goes out to practice good works, remaining joined always to the Spirit of God.⁴⁷

Significantly enough, this practical life, distinguished by Ruysbroeck from the active, is denominated the common. The active life, inspired by grace, is essentially the work of the human will. The common life, on the contrary, depends on God alone. The eloquent fourteenth chapter of the *Sparkling Stone* is entitled: "Of That Common Life that Comes from the Contemplation and Fruition of God." Here Ruysbroeck balances the active and the contemplative. As Underhill says, "his rapturous ascents toward Divine Reality were compensated by the eager and loving interest with which he turned toward the world of men."⁴⁸ Ruysbroeck explains it thus: "The man who is sent down by God from these heights into the world is full of truth and rich in all virtues . . . he possesses a rich and a generous ground, which is set in the richness of God; and therefore he must always spend himself on those who have need of him; for the living fount of the Holy Ghost, which is his wealth, can never be spent . . . he possesses a universal life, for he is ready alike for contemplation and for action, and is perfect in both of them."⁴⁹

Likewise, it is correct to say that Ruysbroeck's mysticism and ecclesiology support and clarify each other. He knows the human faults and schismatic shames of Mother Church. But he also knows her Petrine foundation, her apostolic power and order, and her ultimate invincibility. He believes in her hierarchy, her priesthood and her sacraments. These last are the channels of God's love, the visible form of invisible grace.⁵⁰ They are another coming of Christ the Bridegroom that takes place every day.⁵¹ To be desired with a loving heart, the sacrament is needful for him who would "remain steadfast and go forward in eternal life." From Mother Church Ruysbroeck accepts his commission to serve world humanity. Such a man truly goes forth, after the fourfold way he sets down: namely, toward Christ and all saints; towards sinners and all perverted men; toward purgatory; toward himself and all good men.⁵²

In Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1461) there appears a life of contemplation, defined both as to its rarified intellectualism and its intimate spiritual communion; also a life of action, proved in the routine lanes of

social ministry as this affected educational, clerical, conciliar, and diocesan labors.⁵³

The experience of God found in the *Vision* and *The Learned Ignorance* is that of ineffable sweetness and intellectually ordered delight.⁵⁴ The theme of these works as of the *Sermons* and many tracts is the translatability of God's love revealed in Christ to the sober work of the world. The need and the power of Christiformity constitute the passionate refrain of his sermonic exhortations.⁵⁵ The joyous burden of his efforts as scholar, teacher, writer, preacher, scientist, philosopher, conciliarist, bishop, and cardinal was the application of the contemplative way opened through Christ to the active way pursued with Christ. In Him, who was the Mediator between God and man, the life of contemplation has already become the way of action. The goal of action is the consummating union with the Eternal. "In contrast to all other forms of religion which fail of true life, the Way to eternal life was revealed to us through Jesus, the Son of God, who made known to us the nature of the heavenly life which the sons of God enjoy, the assurance that we may achieve the sonship of God, and the means by which we may accomplish it . . . The faithful Christian, by the work of faith through love, enters through the gate and finds himself in the Way. The gate is faith. The Way is love. Thus faith in Christ becomes both gate and Way. The word of God the Father summons us . . . to that sort of existence which the intellectual life enjoys, because it understands its own existence. The Word made flesh summons the intellectual life through grace to fellowship with the Word, through which it tastes, in the fountain of the Father, the sweetness of his divine life, which is imparted to the sons of God."⁵⁶

The way of this faith that is the beginning of understanding, the learned ignorance by which Paul saw the Christ formerly hidden to him, the verities revealing themselves to him who raises himself to Christ by faith—all these are a part of the vision that unites the believer to Christ and the holy wisdom with which contemplation invests itself in action.⁵⁷

Cusa followed the vision celestial into the harvest field of the world. This is best proved in his works that celebrate the Church, her sacraments, her hierarchy, and her preached gospel as the servants of the eternal kingdom in the temporal world. The *Catholic Concordance*, like his *Sermons*, learnedly supports the ecclesiastical hierarchy as it recapitulates the heavenly ordering. Dionysian in much of its development, his thought is fully conversant with that of the great Fathers. His pastoral practice and his loyalty both to the papacy and to the highest conciliar ideals are in line with the Church's noblest traditions of participating unity and communicating service. The socializing qualities of the eternal kingdom vitalize the ecclesiastical community.⁵⁸ The ecclesiasti-

cal community offers its mystical body and its living sacrifices in ministry to the body societal. The sacraments, administered by the priesthood which is presided over by duly appointed prelates, come to their fullest, sacrificial expression in the Eucharist. Here Christ the head, united to the Father, spiritually vivifies the faithful in a redemptive work in, and for, the world.

Here, then, was the bread of life—Christ the bread-giving life—bread obtainable only by faith, faith that called alike for the preaching of the gospel and the justifying host. "The love of your neighbor is not enough, unless it is also in God, and the existence of the sacrament is necessary for salvation, so that you may be incorporated in the unity of the body of Christ and the head of Christ, for otherwise you cannot live."⁵⁹

To have the vision of God; to find new wisdom in the realization of one's ignorance without him—this was to make Cusa, not a paragon of perfection, but the truly amazing episcopos of intellect and society in the fifteenth-century world. Through him, the mystical Body of Christ, harmonized after the similitude of heaven, sought to nourish the broken unity of the world. Having climbed the mount of contemplation for the vision of God, Cusa had no choice but to minister in the villages, towns, and country-side where Jesus so actively trod.

Recently, Dean W. R. Inge joined battle once more with an old but resurgent innuendo: "Your mystics save their own souls; society they neither save nor care to save." He reminds us, likewise, of an unpalatable fact: "The charge that the 'religious,' in the technical sense, are useless drones might be levelled at scholars and thinkers generally." People of our own profession can use the generous reassurance he offers: "But a man may be a useful member of society without producing commodities." This is surely as applicable to the mystics as to ourselves. Truly the saints have been great servants of mankind. The mystic witness is inescapably clear, "the explorers of the high places of the spiritual world have not wasted their time." Writing in 1899, Dean Inge declared that the pupils of Eckhart "were no advocates of pious indolence." He said in 1948: "I might have quoted the warnings of Eckhart and other contemplatives, that we ought at once to suspend our communings with God if we have an opportunity of helping our neighbour. The great mystics are quite above criticism on this point." History ungrudgingly sustains his verdict.⁶⁰

- 1 Recognition of and reaction to such charges are found, for example, in *The Cloud of Unknowing*, chaps. 18, 24, and 25, in the modernized edition of Dom Justin McCann (London, 1943), pp. 29-30, 36-38, and in the critical Middle English text of Phyllis Hodgson, *Early English Text Society*, No. 218 (London, 1944), pp. 48-49, 58-61; likewise in Baron Friedrich von Hügel, *The Mystical Element in Religion* . . . (London, 1927), II, 351-66, W. R. Inge, *Christian Mysticism* . . . (London, 1899, 1925), pp. 11, 160-61, 188 ff.; also his *Mysticism in Religion* . . . (Chicago, 1948), pp. 144 ff.
- 2 Dom Cuthbert Butler, *Western Mysticism* . . . (New York, 1923), recapitulates with a brilliant selection, translation, and commentary of source-texts the Church's true balance. Hereafter abbreviated as WM.
- 3 See the *Tract. In Ioan.* exxiv. 5 as translated in WM, 196, and closely paraphrased here.
- 4 Consult *Contra Faustum*, XXII, 52-58, in the edition of M. Péronne, et al.; *Oeuvres complètes de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1870), XXVI, 199-208; cf. WM, 198-200.
- 5 *Sermones ad populum*, I Ser., *Sermones*, CIII-CIV, Péronne, *op. cit.*, XVII, 128-136; II Ser. *Sermo*, CCLV, Péronne, *op. cit.* XVIII, 313-16; also WM, 200 f.
- 6 *De Civ. Dei*, XIX, 2 and 19.
- 7 The above quotations are from *De Civ. Dei*, XIX, 19, in the edition of W. J. Oates, *Basic Writings of Saint Augustine* (New York, 1948), II, 495-96.
- 8 Especially influential in later thought were Gregory the Great and Bernard of Clairvaux. Both emphasized the necessity of preachers', pastors', and superiors' following a mixed life. Gregory noted that Jesus spent prayerful night-watches in mountain retreats; but he blessed the people all the more with a day-time ministry in field, village, and town. Bernard insisted that action and contemplation are room-mates. Martha is sister to Mary. One must ever be prepared for the summons from indispensable contemplation to unavoidable action. But woe to him who attempts social benevolence out of contemplative penury. Cf. WM, 212 ff. Pertinent resumes and source references apropos Augustine, Gregory, Bonaventura, the Victorines, Thomas Aquinas, and others are provided in J. Stelzenberger, *Die Mystik des Johannes Gerson* (Breslau, 1928), pp. 25 ff., and in Hodgson, *The Cloud of Unknowing*, pp. lxx-lxxvii.
- 9 In the translation of E. A. Peers (London, 1925), chap. IV, 6, pp. 48-49. Abbreviated as ACPe (IV, 6), 48-49 etc.
- 10 ACPe (II, 6), 31; cf. pp. 11-12. See the illuminating study of J. H. Probst, *La mystique de Ramon Lull et l'art de contemplació*, together with an edition of the Catalan text in C. Baumer's *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen* (Münster, i/v., 1914), XIII, 2-3; 1-124.
- 11 Translated by E. A. Peers (New York, 1923), No. 61, p. 33=BLB (61), 38 etc.
- 12 BLB (134), 56; cf. (354, 364-65), 111, 114.
- 13 From the *Disputatio clerici et Raymundi phantastici* as edited by P. Golubovich, *Biblioteca Bio-Bibliografica della Terra Santa* (Quaracchi, 1906), I (19), 388. Indispensable source-texts, summaries, and references are found also in E. Longpré, "Raymond (Le bienheureux) L u l l e," *Dictionnaire Théologie Catholique* IX. 1 (Paris, 1926); M-P-E. Littré-B. Hauréau, et al., "Raimond Lulle," *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXIX (Paris, 1900); C. Ottaviano, *L'ars compendiosa de E. Lull* . . . (Paris, 1930); P. Otto Keicher, "Raymundus Lullus und seine Stellung zur arabischen Philosophie," in C. Baumer's *Beiträge* (Münster, 1909), VII, 4-5: 1-223; A. S. Atiya, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 1938), pp. 74-94. These are abbreviated with reference to item numbers and/or columns, pages, etc. as follows: Go (19), 388; Lg (3), 1096; Lt (LIV), 240-41; Ot (153), 76; Ke, 42, etc. Ot is indispensable for its table of Lullian works cross-referenced to leading editions and commentators.
- 14 *Liber contemplationis* [in *Deum*], Majorca, after 1277, OT (5), 33, analyzed in Lg (1), 1090, and more fully in Lt (XLVIII), 220-35.
- 15 *Liber de consilio divinarum dignitatum*, drawn from the *De civitate mundi*, 1314, as reproduced, in part, by Lg (5928), 1102.
- 16 Summary of the *Arbor Scientiae*, Rome, 1295, in Lg (2), 1090-91; cf. Ot (57), 47; Lt (LXXII), 249-50.
- 17 Note the significance of the *Ars generalis* (Ke, 18-23); the *Liber clericorum*, Pisa, 1308 [OT (117), 66; Ke, 42 and n. 3; Lt (LXXVIII), 255-56; Lg (30), 1099]; the *Doctrina pueril*, Majorca, c. 1275 [Ot (1), 32; Lg. (2), 1108; Lt. (CCXV), 325; Ke, 42]; *De lege meliore*, Majorca, 1313 [Ot (171), 80; Ke, 42 and n. 2; Lt (CCXIX), 327-28; Lg (52), 1101]; *Disputatio clerici*, 1311 [OT (158), 76; Go (19), 388; Ke, 40-41 and n. 1; Lt (LIV), 240-41; Lg (7), 1109].
- 18 BLB (138), 57.
- 19 Peculiar importance attaches to the following works: *The Petitio Raymundi (per conversione Infidelium) ad Coelestinum V et ad cardinales directa* Naples, 1294, pleads with pope, cardinals, and priests to make available at whatever cost the Church's spiritual and physical

treasures for recalling the infidel to the saving light of truth. (The Latin text is given in full by Go (3), 373-75, and a French translation in Lt (IX), 104-07: cf. Ot (54), 46; Lg (2), 1108). The *Petitio Raymundi pro conversione infidelium et pro recuperatione Terrae Sanctae* [ad Bonifacium VIII], Rome, 1295-96, is quite similar [Ot (59), 43; Go (4), 375; Lt (CCLIII), 341; Lg (3), 1109]. The *Raymundi Lulli epistolae tres*, 1298-99, includes one to the University of Paris arguing for linguistic studies looking to peaceful missionization of adversaries: *possimus in gladio veritatis eorum vincere falsitates, et reddere populum Deo acceptabilem, et inimicos convertere in amicos*— Go (5), 375. [Cf. H. Denifle, et A. Chatelain, *Charitativum Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1889-1897), II, i, 83-84; Lt (XC), 261, 33]. *Liber de fine*, i.e. the *De expugnatione Terrae Sanctae*, Montpellier, 1305, gives detailed plans for both peaceful conversion and an armed Crusade. It is well analyzed with quotation of key texts in Atiya, *The Crusade*, pp. 77-85 and notes. [Cf. Lt (CCXLII), 337; Ot (108), 63; Go (14) 382-83]. The *Disputatio Raymundi Lulli et Homerii Saraceni*, Pisa, 1308, asks provision for monasteries emphasizing study of languages by regulars and seculars, a union of military orders, and the rededication of the Church's tithes, now deflected to other purposes, for the crusading cause [See the extended analysis in Lt. (XXV), 152-58; Ot (112), 65; Go (15), 383-85]. *Liber de acquisitione Terrae Sanctae*, Montpellier, 1309, proposes a maritime crusade, propaganda assaults on Saracens, Jews, heretics, Greek schismatics, and Tartars in accordance with the *Ars generalis*, and the establishment of monastic courses in oriental languages at Rome, Paris and Toledo [Go (16), 385-86; Lt (CCLIV), 342-43; Ot (123), 68]. The *Liber natalis* or *De natali pueri parvuli Christi Jesu*, Paris, 1310, calls for recovery of the Holy Land for the honor of Christ, with the express approval of His Virgin Mother. It poignantly focuses Lull's own sense of frustration. It is extensively and critically analyzed as "cet erit bizarre" in Lt (LIII), 237-40, more sympathetically in Go (18), 386-88; Ot (142), 72. *Disputatio clerici . . . et phantastici*, 1311, presents a dialogue between the dreamer Raymond and his critic, a blasé, well-endowed priest, as Lull goes to the Council of Vienne to press for schools of language, united military orders, and proscription of Averroism in the universities [Go (19), 388; Lt (LIV), 240-41; Lg (7), 1109; Ke, 40-41; Ot (158), 76]. *Petitio Raymundi in concilio generali . . .*, Vienne, 1311, contains the

famous ten proposals for: (1) Papal establishment of three colleges of language at Paris, Rome, and Toledo; (2) Occupation service by coalesced military orders; (3) Crusading provisions with excommunication for princes opposing papal tax levies; (4) Papal diversion, *ad passagium*, of one part of all the prebends and spoils of deceased Bishops; (5) Reform of the Church, internally; (6) Interdiction of all philosophies held contrary to Christian theology; (7) Withdrawal of all usurers' testamentary rights; (8) Substitution of syllogism for declamation in sermons before Jews and Saracens; (9-10) mandatory use by all professors of law and medicine of Lull's *Ars juris* and *Ars medicinae* [Go (20), 388; Lt (CCLII), 340-41; Ot (160), 76; Lg (8), 1109]. *De participatione Christianorum et Saracenorum*, Majorca, 1312, after Lull's post-conciliar arrival at Vienne, responds with appreciation for the Council's provision for linguistic instruction and the resumption of the Templars' previous crusade functions by the Order of St. John; with suggestions that Christian and Muslim professors meet in a joint commission looking to irenic settlement rather than armed decision [Go (21), 389-92; Ot (165), 78; Lt (CCLV), 343; Lg (9), 1109; cf. Canon 11, Council of Vienne, in H. J. Schroeder, *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (St. Louis 1937), Latin text, pp. 615-16, translation, pp. 395-96; Denifle and Chatelain, *Chart.*, II, No. 695, n. 1].

- 20 In addition to the biographies by Go (1), 365-72; Ke, 8-35; Lg (I), 1072-88; Lt, 1-67, etc., see the useful summaries of his career and significance in O. Gratien, *Histoire . . . de l'ordre des frères mineurs au XIII^e siècle* (Paris 1928), pp. 660 ff., and F. de Sessevalle, *Histoire générale de l'ordre de Saint François* (Le Puy-En-Velay, 1937), I Pt. Tome II, pp. 713-28.
- 21 Predigt III: "Diz ist onch Meister Eckhart der lerte die Wahrheit alle vart," in F. Pfeiffer, *Meister Eckhart* (Leipzig, 1857; Göttingen, 1924), pp. 16-24. See a translation into modern German by H. Büttner, *Meister Eckharts Schriften und Predigten . . .* (Jena, 1923), I, 91-101. An English translation based on Pfeiffer is that of C. de B. Evans, *Meister Eckhart* (London, 1924), 14-20. The passage is quoted from R. B. Blakney, *Meister Eckhart: A Modern Translation* (New York, 1941), p. 111. Cf. M. de Gandillac et al., *Maître Eckhart: Traités et sermons* (Paris, 1942), for translations into French. These key works are abbreviated by sermon number and/or pp. as follows: Pf (3), 16-24; Bu, Ev, Bl, Gn, etc. The reference to Thomas Aquinas is evidently *Summa Theologica*, IIa, IIae,

- Q. 182. a.l: "Yet, in a restricted sense and in a particular case one should prefer the active life on account of the needs of the present life. P. D. Mezard—E. C. McEniry, *Saint Thomas Aquinas Meditations for Every Day* (Somerset, Ohio, 1938), p. 406.
- 22 *Reden der Unterweisung*, VI, as translated into modern German by J. Bernhart (München, 1922), pp. 28-34, especially, pp. 32-34. Cf. Bu (4), II, 11-14; Bl (6), 7-10; Gn (VI), 31-34.
- 23 Compare Chap. II of J. M. Clark, *The Great German Mystics: Eckhart, Tauler, and Suso* (Oxford, 1949)—where the entire issue is subjected to closest scrutiny after the sources and cumulative literature—with documents, appendices, and notes in Bl. Cf. also Gn. 263-67.
- 24 *Reden der Unterweisung*, XX-XXIII, in Bernhart, *op. cit.*, 65 ff.; Bl, 27 ff., Bu (12), II, 32 ff.; Gn (XX-XXIII), 51 ff. Note, especially, Sermon XXII in Pf (LXXVI), 238 ff.; Ev (LXXVI), 185 ff.; Bu, II 143 ff.; Bl, 197 ff.; Gn, 239 ff.
- 25 Fragment 14 quoted from Bl, 238; Pf (33), 607; Ev. 425.
- 26 "Divisiones ministracionum sunt, idem autem spiritus et cetera," I Cor. 12:6 f., is no. 42 in F. Vetter's, *Die Predigten Taulers* [Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters, XI] (Berlin, 1910), pp. 176-81. See a modern German version in W. Lehmann, *Johannes Tauler Predigten* (Jena, 1913), I, 186-91. A French translation from the Latin of Surius is E. P. Noël, *Oeuvres complètes de Jean Tauler* (Paris, 1911), III, 454-64. For an English translation see W. Elliott, *The Sermons and Conferences of John Tauler* . . . (Washington, D. C., 1910), pp. 472-76. These are hereafter abbreviated as Ve (42), 176-81; Le, No, El, etc.
- 27 "Johannes est nomen eius." Luc. 1:63 [Ve. (40), 162-69; Le (40) 1, 171 f.; El, 646-53, particularly, 648 f. Compare A. W. Hutton, *The Inner Way: Being Thirty-six Sermons for Festivals by John Tauler* (London, n. d.), pp. 82 ff.=Hu (X), 82.
- 28 These are, in the Strasburg MS of Vetter, Nos. 29, 30, 31 (Engelberger, 60 d, c. f), 32 and 33; also 34 and 35 Strasburg (=Engelberger 60 g and h). They are dispersed in El and No.
- 29 "Karissimi, estote unanimis in oratione" [Ve (39), 154-62; Le (39), I, 162-71; No. III, 316 f.; El, 434-41. Compare "Eecce prandium meum paravi" [Ve (74), 398-403; Le (74), II, 207 ff.; No. IV, 210-25; El, 564-69]. See the apparently complete subordination to Pope, Church, Sacraments, in "Sequere me," Matt. 9:9, Hu (XXIII), 201-02; El, 706 f. Cf. R. Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London, 1909-23), 275-76.
- 30 "Estote misericordes sicut et pater vester misericors est," Luc. 6:36 f. [Ve (62), 336-41; Le (62), II, 142-47; El, 428-33; No. III, 300-15; Cf. R. C. Petry, *No Uncertain Sound* (Philadelphia, 1948), 47: 241-46; Hu (IX), 73]. See also, "Bene omnia fecit: surdos fecit audire et mutos loqui," Marc. 7:31 f. [Ve (44), 190-94; Le (44), I, 200-04; No. IV, 26-33; El, 494-97; Pe, 48: 246-49; Hu (IV), 28-30; also the more apparent than real contradiction in Hu (XV), 127 ff.
- 31 F. M. M. Comper, Ed., *The Fire of Love* . . . (London, 1914), chap. XXI, pp. 93-96, and the *Form of Perfect Living*, chap. XII, in C. Horstman, *Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole* (London, 1895), I, 46-47, 416-17—Middle English texts.
- 32 Contrast the strong appeal for the "medled" life, following Gregory, in Walter Hilton's *Epistle on Mixed Life*, in G. G. Perry, *English Prose Treatises: Richard Rolle of Hampole*, EETS, 20 (London, 1866), where it is wrongly attributed to Rolle, and in Horstman, *op. cit.*, I, 264 ff., where it is properly ascribed to Hilton.
- 33 All the foregoing quotations are from chap. XXI of the *Fire of Love*, ed. by Comper, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-96.
- 34 Cf. the "Translation of the Legenda in the Office Prepared for the Blessed Hermit Richard," reproduced in Comper, *op. cit.*, pp. xlv, ff.
- 35 Consult the edition of G. Hodgson, *Rolle and "Our Daily Work"* (London, 1929); cf. Horstman, *op. cit.*, I, 310-21.
- 36 Cf. Comper, *op. cit.*, p. x.
- 37 Cf. G. Hodgson, *Richard Rolle's Version of the Penitential Psalms* (London, 1928), Ps CI, 23 n. 9, 41; Cf. Hodgson, *Our Daily Work*, pp. 56-59.
- 38 Compare the editions of Dom McCann and P. Hodgson described in note 1, and hereafter abbreviated as CUM and CUH, by chapters and pages. Cf. CUH, lvii-lxxvii.
- 39 CUM (17-20), 28-32.
- 40 Chaps. 16-23, especially.
- 41 CUM (8), 15-16; CUH (8), 31.
- 42 CUM (18), 29 f.; CUH (18), 48 f.
- 43 Compare CUM (24-25), 36-38, with the unmodernized text of CUH (24-25), 58-61.
- 44 CUM, p. xxi.
- 45 A. W. D'Aygaliers *Ruysbroeck l' Admirable* (Paris, 1923), pp. 286 ff., has an excellent, source-documented discussion of the three ways. Cf. E. Underhill, *Ruysbroeck* (London, 1914), chaps. V-VIII on the active, the interior, and the superessential life. For the three unities and the three lives see Book II, chapter ii. of the *Adornment of Spiritual Marriage*, edited together with *The Sparkling Stone*, and the *Book of Supreme Truth*, by E. Underhill (New York, 1916), pp. 52 ff. The above works are

- hereafter abbreviated as Ay, UR, ASM, SS, BST, etc. Cf. BST, chaps. I-VI, especially, for union with means, without means, etc. Cf. St. Axters, *La spiritualité des pays-bas* (Louvain, 1948), pp. 41-60.
- 46 On the contemplative life in balanced relation to practical action see Ay, 299-304 in connection, particularly, with ASM, III, i-iv, and the superb chaps. IX and XIV of the SS; cf. BST, IV, VIII, XIII, etc. and UR, 19-20.
- 47 Cf. SS, XI, and Ay, 304.
- 48 Pp. xv-xvi, introd. to ASM etc.
- 49 SS, 220-21. Compare SS, VII: "We find nowadays many silly men who would be so interior and so detached, that they will not be active or helpful in any way of which their neighbours are in need. Know, such men are neither hidden friends nor yet true servants of God, but are wholly false and disloyal; for none can follow His counsels but those who obey His laws." Cf. UR, 117. See also J. A. Bizet, *Ruysbroeck: Oeuvres Choiesies* (Paris, 1946), "Le royaume des amants," V. v, 176-78, on the common life.
- 50 See Ay, 306-09.
- 51 ASM, I, vii, 19; II, xlv, 109-10.
- 52 ASM, II, xxxix-xliii, 102-07.
- 53 Note the basic life by E. Vansteenberghe, *Le cardinal Nicolas de Cues* 1401-1464, *l' action, la pensée* (Paris, 1920).
- 54 Consult *The Vision of God*, translated by E. G. Salter (New York, 1928) and *De la docte ignorance*, French translation by L. Moulinier (Paris, 1930). M. de Gandillac's *Oeuvres choisies de Nicolas de Cues* (Paris, n. d.) gives well-balanced, if all too brief, selections. Note, especially, in the *Vision*, chap. VIII: That the Gaze of God is Itself the Loving, Effecting, Reading, and Possessing of All Things in Itself; XIII: That God is Seen to be Absolute Infinity;
- XIX: How Jesus is the Union of God and Man; XXIV: How Jesus is the Word of Life. Compare in *De la docte ignorance*, I, i: Comment "savior" est "ignorerer"; III, 11: Les mysteres de la foi; III, 12: L'eglise.
- 55 These themes predominate in the *Exortationum ex sermonibus* edited in the *Opera Omnia* of H. Petri, 3 vols. (Basel, 1565). See also the *Wichtigste Schriften in deutscher Uebersetzung* von Dr. F. N. Scharpff (Freiburg i/B, 1862). Cf. the late editions of J. Koch, et al., *Predigten* (Heidelberg, 1937). See also the references in R. C. Petry, "Emphasis on the Gospel and Christian Reform in Late Medieval Preaching," *Church History* XVI (June, 1947), especially pp. 88 ff. and nn. 51 ff.
- 56 From the sermon, "Where is He Who is Born King of the Jews?"—Matt. 2:2 (On the Epiphany: at Brixen, 1456), as translated from Koch, in Petry, NUS, 58: 293-94.
- 57 See the *Docte*, III, 11, 210 ff.; cf. the *Vision*, XXV: How Jesus is the Consummation, pp. 126 f.
- 58 The remarkable First Book of the *De Concordantia Catholica* may be studied in the excellent edition of the *Opera Omnia* by G. Kallen (Leipzig, 1939). Cf. Vansteenberghe, *op cit.*, pp. 34-51. See French translations of portions from later Books in Gandillac, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 ff. Note materials from *Ezeit*. VIII, 603-05 translated into German by Scharpff, *op. cit.*, pp. 417-20. Cf. also Petry, "Emphasis on the Gospel," pp. 88 ff. and nn. 51 ff.
- 59 "From a Sermon on the Eucharist," translated in Petry, NUS, 57:291.
- 60 See note 1, for the works of 1899 and 1948. The quotation on Eckhart's pupils is from *Christian Mysticism* (1899), p. 188. All others are from *Mysticism in Religion* (1948), pp. 143-44. Cf. note 49, SS VII.

"ANABAPTISM" AND ITALY

HENRY A. DEWIND

Olivet College

Modern research dealing with the radical fringe of the Reformation has by-passed the problem of that Italian evangelical movement which is usually assumed to have been connected with northern "Anabaptism." Students of "Anabaptist" history, however, while they have sought to clarify the distinctions within the movement as well as the features common to its component parts, have laid the groundwork for a reconsideration of the precise position of the Italian radicals. One approach to the problem might focus attention on the question of the relationship of Italian reformers to the "Anabaptist" movement in general. However, it has become increasingly obvious that the term "Anabaptism" was applied to a great variety of individuals and groups which had in common little more than their condemnation of infant baptism. As new criteria have been set up for separating the parts of this confusing mixture, there stand out most prominently at the center of the "Anabaptist" movement certain sects which modern German scholars call the "Täufer," viz., the Swiss Brethren, the Hutterite Brethren, and the Mennonites; and we shall follow their usage here.¹ The Täufer differed from the Protestant state churches principally in their conception of the nature of the church and in their stress on discipleship. The latter emphasis implies man's ability to lead a life patterned after the life of Christ, while their conception of the church as a closed community of voluntary believers underlay their insistence upon the need for adult baptism. This insistence, which carried with it a denial of the efficacy of infant baptism, was the point in their teachings that aroused the opposition of contemporaries, signifying, as it did, their non-conformity to established practices and institutions. However, to set it up as the distinctive feature of their teaching is to exaggerate one of the consequences of their beliefs at the expense of their basic assumptions. Furthermore, the Täufer should be distinguished from other non-conformists who are also frequently called "Anabaptists." Unlike many of these, the Täufer never forsook the body of Christian theological and Christological teachings as they are formulated in the traditional creeds, nor were they fanatical millenarianists, individualistic spiritual reformers, or ardent social revolutionaries.

Keeping in mind the fact that the word "Anabaptist" has been much abused, let us now reexamine the main features of the Italian "Anabaptist" movement, the neglect of which has led to the anomalous situation wherein Mennonite historians have admitted the existence of an Italian antitrinitarian "Anabaptist" movement but have denied the designation "Anabaptist" to antitrinitarians elsewhere.²

Our fragmentary information on this subject comes from several sources. Karl Benrath³ and Emilio Comba⁴ have studied and summarized a number of documents containing information about a radical evangelical movement which flourished in Venetia in the years around 1550, and Comba has published some of the pertinent documents.⁵ While both scholars consider it proper to call the movement "Anabaptist," Benrath shows some uneasiness in following the common practice in this respect. Several documents published by Berti⁶ show that the Venetian movement had connections in Naples; and in addition, there was a movement in the Raetian Leagues (now the Swiss Canton of Graubünden), possibly starting from independent origins and probably representing the source of the north Italian growth; we learn of its history from the correspondence between Bullinger and the reformed ministers of that area.⁷ The material published by Comba and Berti and the correspondence of the Raetian ministers contain the core of the proof for the existence of Italian "Anabaptism." It will be our task to restudy these documents in order to determine precisely what were the characteristics of the Italian movement and what relation existed between it and other Protestant churches and sects, especially the Täufer.

Graubiinden.—The first case where there is definite proof that some Italian reformers were deviating from the basic evangelical norm comes from the Engadine valley,⁸ to which many Italians fled after the establishment of the Roman Inquisition in 1542. Among these refugees were the preachers Francesco Calabrese and Girolamo Marliano, whose unorthodox sermons soon embroiled them in difficulties with the Swiss churches; and both men were expelled from the Leagues by action of civil officials in accordance with the provisions of the decree of Davos which granted toleration only to the Catholic and reformed religions.⁹ The heresies of the two Italians, which came to the surface in a disputation between them and representatives of the reformed churches, consisted of the rejection of infant baptism, a rigorous emphasis on predestination, and the assertion that after bodily death the soul sleeps until the Last Judgment.¹⁰ Schiess and Cantimori call these doctrines "Anabaptist,"¹¹ obviously on the basis of the article rejecting infant baptism. However, the objections of the two Italians to that practice were based on their interest in promoting a religion of the spirit or on their conviction of the unimportance of outward ceremonialism for a strict predestinarianism and not on presuppositions like those of the Täufer. The

documents make no claim that these men were in any way connected with the Täufer.

The next example of radical teachings by Italians comes from the town of Chiavenna, which since 1512 had been politically subject to the Leagues. Chiavenna became, and for a long time remained, a magnet for Italians holding a variety of heretical opinions on dogmatic questions. The chief among these men, most of whom shared an inclination to subject accepted doctrines and practices to humanistic standards of criticism, was the Sicilian, Camillo Renato, who fled from Italy in 1542 and settled in Chiavenna four years later. Renato soon came into dispute with the reformed pastor Agostino Mainardi over the proper interpretation of baptism and the Lord's Supper. His distinctive view on this subject was that these two sacraments were humanly evolved means of commemorating or signifying a man's acceptance of Christian principles and, properly speaking, were not divinely ordained "sacraments" at all.¹² A synod supported Mainardi's orthodox interpretation and sought to silence Renato in 1547;¹³ and when Mainardi brought the affair personally to the attention of Bullinger, leader of the Swiss Reformation at Zurich, the latter concluded that Renato was a dangerous heretic.¹⁴

It is clear that by this time (late 1548) Renato had come under suspicion of greater heresies than those dealing with the sacraments. At Bullinger's request Mainardi listed the erroneous views of Renato,¹⁵ introducing them with the statement that he was condemning the errors of the "Anabaptists." If this list accurately reflects Renato's opinions, the catalogue of his errors is as follows: he believed in the sleep of souls; he doubted the orthodox teachings on natural law and the Decalogue, on original sin, on the sacraments, and on justification; he believed Jesus to have been born a man, able to sin; he questioned the role usually claimed for Jesus in our salvation; he held that evil men are not raised at the Last Judgment, thus denying the existence of hell; he argued that the unregenerate, like beasts, are not imbued with the Spirit; he challenged the validity of baptism when it is performed by an erring ministrant; and he claimed that baptism was not the successor to circumcision. While it is impossible to trace the genesis of Renato's teaching on baptism, it is as likely that he arrived at it through independent thought as through influence from the Täufer. Perhaps the most reasonable explanation is that he came upon the fairly widespread teaching which condemned infant baptism and, finding it in harmony with his own humanistically-oriented opinions, incorporated it with them. A superficial observer would then conclude that Renato had some connection with other heretics who held the same doctrine.

In May, 1549, Renato was still in Chiavenna; and we have word of the activities of some of his followers, especially of one Pietro of

Casalmaggiore who openly asserted that Catholic baptism was evil.¹⁶ Pietro, whom Mainardi called an "Anabaptist," was a member of Renato's following and may have shared other of his opinions, but his only recorded teaching is that which made out Catholic baptism to be evil. He, however, also placed emphasis upon the spiritual side of religion.

Did these two qualities make Pietro a Täufer or prove that Pietro had Täufer connections? In contrast to the characteristic conception held by the Swiss Brethren, the Hutterites, and the Mennonites, that baptism was the seal of an adult's belief and of his admission to membership in a closed community of likeminded believers, Pietro and his followers grounded their demand for a new baptism on the fact that the old infant baptism had been performed within the Catholic Church.¹⁷ This approach led them to insist on a new and legitimate performance of the sacrament for all those who had been baptized only in the Catholic Church—consequently, of the bulk of the reformers, nay, of the Christians of that time. They were not objecting to infant baptism so much as to Catholic baptism. It may be argued, therefore, that when Mainardi called Pietro an "Anabaptist," he was rightly accusing him of being a "rebaptizer" but not of being an opponent of infant baptism on principle. As a matter of fact, however, Mainardi was using the expression "Anabaptist" for polemical purposes and not to indicate the subtle distinction just described, so his lack of precision is quite understandable. That other quality found in Pietro, the emphasis on the spiritual, was not a distinctive characteristic of the Täufer. We need only examine the results of recent historical research, which has illuminated the differences between the various sects and individuals commonly called "Anabaptist," to realize that many of the latter should properly be called "spiritual reformers" and not be confused with the Täufer.¹⁸

Another friend of Renato, Tiziano, made his appearance in Chiavenna, probably in 1549. Mainardi describes how the synod ordered this "Anabaptist" to be beaten and expelled from the Leagues because of his activities on behalf of Renato's radical opinions.¹⁹ At first Tiziano had refused to sign a confession renouncing his alleged heresies, but finally the threat of death combined with the urgings of the Spirit (which he professed as his sole guide) to persuade him that it was best to make this concession to the orthodox reformers. While the confession was prepared by the reformed pastor Gallicius, who had earlier played a role in the hearings concerning Francesco Calabrese in the Engadine, its contents probably give a reasonably accurate clue to Tiziano's thought. We gather from it that Tiziano rejected the doctrines of the Trinity, of the co-eternality of Jesus with the Father, of the role of Jesus in man's salvation, of the conception of Jesus by the Holy Spirit, and of the permanent virginity of Mary. He also doubted the complete verity of the Scriptures, holding the authority of the Spirit to be superior to that

of the written word. He condemned infant baptism, claiming that its invalidity made necessary the rebaptism of adults. He asserted that Christians could not hold the office of any magistrate who was required to use force in the fulfillment of his official duties.²⁰

Tiziano affords an excellent example of a man whose beliefs combined elements from radical antitrinitarianism with formal practices seemingly derived from the Täufer. His confession, on the face of it, would indicate that such connections may have existed. To place stress on the role of the Spirit and the need for adult baptism is common to many sects, but the opinions dealing with magistral office are more commonly thought of as peculiar to the Täufer. However, let us recall that Tiziano did not himself prepare the confession, for that was done by Gallicius; the confession consequently contains Gallicius's ideas of Tiziano's beliefs and not necessarily those beliefs themselves. In other words, Tiziano may have held opinions similar to those of the Täufer without having derived them from the Täufer; and the similarity may have confused Gallicius. What is more likely is that Tiziano derived his beliefs on baptism and office-holding from the spiritual premises of his own religion. For him adult baptism, or rebaptism, signified confession of faith but did not admit to a closed community of believers. The Täufer furthermore were not the only sects which renounced office-holding where the use of the sword was required.²¹ The absence from Tiziano's teaching of any more precise Täufer views indicates that he was a spiritual reformer and that there is no more than a superficial resemblance between his teachings and the Täufer doctrines.

In December, 1549, at Mainardi's request and with Bullinger's approval the troublesome affair of Camillo Renato was taken up by a synod of the League churches in Chur. The synod decided that Mainardi was in the right in the struggle, and Gallicius forthwith drew up a set of orthodox articles covering the points in dispute.²² A striking thing about these results of ministerial investigation is that, while they contain some further information about Renato's heresies they do not even mention the word "Anabaptist." Renato paid little heed to the synod's order to cease public preaching and teaching; in consequence he suffered public excommunication in the summer of 1550. According to Mainardi, Renato's chief heresies at this time were the teaching concerning baptism and the doctrine that the souls of men die with their bodies.²³ Finally, after a period of continued activity here and there in the Leagues, Renato was persuaded, partly through the personal influence of the former bishop Pierpaolo Vergerio (who was now serving as a pastor in a small reformed church in the Italian area of the Leagues) to sign a confession jointly with Mainardi and the elders of the Chiavenna church.²⁴ An examination of the contents of this document will make it clear that Renato signed the confession with tongue in cheek.

This confession contains a number of interesting points. (1) By precisely defining the canonical Scriptures it lays stress on the written Word of God. (2) The confession is largely concerned with dogmatic questions about the Trinity and the nature of Christ. (3) It places some emphasis on predestination. (4) It contradicts the Täufer idea that man is capable of leading a life of discipleship. (5) It asserts the validity of Catholic baptism for the reformed churches: this makes rebaptism of those who had been baptized as infants within the Catholic Church unnecessary and sinful. (6) It defends infant baptism as a proper and correct practice, holding that children as well as adults belong within the church of Christ. The confession here spells out the difference between church and sect by insisting that the Täufer concept of the church as a community of righteous men is much too narrow. (7) It denies the teaching that no Christian can be a magistrate.

If the confession was aimed directly at teachings held by Renato, then Renato appears to have assimilated both antitrinitarian and Täufer opinions. Thus, the fourth, sixth, and seventh points treat of principles commonly held by bona fide Täufer. From their presence in the confession we may assume either that Renato did hold Täufer views or that, having been frequently called an "Anabaptist," he was suspect of the genuine Täufer persuasions mentioned above and that they were inserted in the confession to avoid loopholes. In itself the inclusion of these statements in the confession proves neither that Renato was nor that he was not influenced by the Täufer. It shows only that the men who drew up the confession wished to provide for the principal heresies disturbing their church. That is why the confession also includes condemnations of several Catholic tenets, and it is unlikely that anyone would have accused Renato of believing that there were seven sacraments! In the absence of a specific statement of his beliefs by Renato himself, therefore, we have no complete surety about his opinions; and we can call him neither a Täufer nor a Catholic on the basis of the documents we have been considering.

During the first half of 1552 Gallicius accused Pierpaolo Vergerio and Celso Martinenghi, the latter a man of undoubted orthodoxy, of "Anabaptism" because of the support they gave to the candidacy to a ministerial post of a pastor named Paravicini,²⁵ whose main heresies were the denial of Mary's perpetual virginity and of the distinction among the persons of the Trinity. In April Comander, one of the pastors at Chur, was linking the names of Vergerio, Martinenghi, and Paravicini with "Anabaptist" schisms in Italy and the Valtelline.²⁶ The heresies of which Paravicini was accused were not those of the Täufer, nor were they specifically called "Anabaptist" by the reformers; and yet some of the latter thought Martinenghi's support of Vergerio and Paravicini was sufficient evidence to link him to "Anabaptism"—here

then is an excellent example of the hazy understanding the evangelicals had of the meaning of the word they were using. Our own conclusion is that Paravicini, influenced by Renato and supported as a fellow Italian by Vergerio, approaching certain traditionally accepted doctrines with an inquiring and rationalizing mind, found them wanting in reasonableness and consistency with the Scriptures. Paravicini simply illustrates the difficulty a humanistically trained Italian temperament had in adjusting to the requirements for a reformed pastor; he had no connection with the Täufer.

Vergerio's letters show that he had that inclination toward freedom of thought on doctrinal questions which we have noted in other Italians. It is impossible to categorize him simply, however, as his situation was a peculiar one. He had achieved eminence within the Catholic Church before his conscience forced him to exchange his episcopal office for the life of a fugitive in Graubünden, so that it was far from easy for him to adjust to new conditions; and it was quite natural for him to attempt to use his prestige to improve his own position. Vergerio was seriously concerned for the expansion of evangelical churches in the Italian portions of the Leagues, and this concern encouraged him to stand by his fellow Italians in spite of their radical tendencies. As time went on, he came to understand the harm toleration of men like Renato could bring to the League churches. He thereupon swallowed his pride and tried to fit himself into the evangelical organization that was slowly being worked out. In the light of the story of Vergerio's activity in the Leagues, it is preposterous to call him an "Anabaptist," or to suggest that he came into very close contacts with the Täufer. His understanding of the Täufer was as naive as that of most of his contemporaries; and when he was called an "Anabaptist," the charge was strictly polemical. The zealous evangelical pastors seized upon his comparatively tolerant attitude toward deviations from doctrinal norms and included him in blanket accusations which they hurled at liberal-thinking Italian Protestants.

An interesting description of the radical religious situation in the Leagues is contained in a letter written to Bullinger by Comander and Gallicius in April, 1553.²⁷ The letter introduces and summarizes a detailed confession intended for the reformed churches of the Leagues. It is worthy of note that it fails to mention Italian "Anabaptists" and that it properly lists the different heresies as outgrowths of the instability in the faith which characterized many Italian Protestants. Absence of any reference to "Anabaptists" in these particular documents underscores the fact that the orthodox reformers, who were accustomed to use the expression "Anabaptist" for polemical purposes, were more careful in their choice of terminology when they were composing an official statement.

Our next information on heresies in Chiavenna comes from 1561, when Mainardi reported the presence of some "Arians or Anabaptists" in the congregation.²⁸ It turns out that these were liberal-minded men who desired the flexibility of a simple, general confession which would not force them to accept what they regarded as unreasonable and over-subtle definitions. They had the support of a number of the Italian clergy of the Leagues, who sent the pastor Michelangelo Florio to Chur and Zurich with a list of twenty-six questions to be considered by the reformed church's leading theologians.²⁹ These questions had nothing to do with Täufer opinions; rather they are concerned with freedom of conscience in interpreting the Scriptures and latitude of behaviour in conforming to accepted practices.

Chiavenna remained a nursery for heretical teachings, and in 1565 evidence of heresy reappeared when an Italian from Padua was excommunicated for denying the divinity of Christ.³⁰ Girolamo Zanchi, a very learned man who succeeded Mainardi as reformed pastor,³¹ reported having heard that this heresy was widespread in Italy; but he made no attempt to connect it with "Anabaptism." Instead he believed it to be an offspring of the teachings of Servetus.³² In the years 1569-71 Zanchi's successor Lentulo was confronted with the renewed activities of some of the earlier heretics, who had been living in Moravia. The Diet of the Leagues, to forestall further difficulties of this nature, required that henceforth everyone under its jurisdiction should adhere either to the Raetian Confession or to the Catholic Church.³³ The Diet of 1571 was disturbed by attempts to reverse this decree, but the opposition was silenced and henceforth the Leagues enjoyed comparative peace.

Late in 1561 the Chur reformed clergy had come into conflict with some "Anabaptists" from the territories of the Emperor Ferdinand, whose threats of punishment had forced them to seek refuge in the Leagues;³⁴ and the city council had taken disciplinary action against two residents of Chur who had been converted to the faith of these refugees. Now, this incident is very interesting, for it offers us a case of real Täufer activity in an area where former "Anabaptists" turn out to have been antitrinitarians or Servetians. The Täufer in this case were German-speaking people who had fled from the north to avoid persecution by the Emperor, and the two men whom they rebaptized in Chur were not Italians.³⁵ While it is impossible to conclude from this incident that the Italian residents of Chur did not meet up with these northerners, it is significant that there is no reference to Italians among their converts.³⁶ Unfortunately, we hear nothing about the teachings of the German Täufer save their practice of rebaptism. There is no word of Servetian or antitrinitarian doctrines, no hint of any connection with heresies like those we have been considering except in the use of the term "Anabaptist." However, that the people here concerned were quite

different from the so-called Italian "Anabaptists" becomes evident when we examine the sequel to this incident. In 1570 Frell, one of the earlier converts, was again accused of spreading "Anabaptist" propaganda, this time in connection with Schwenckfeldian teachings.³⁷ At a hearing of the Chur council, the pastor Tobias Egli outlined the origins of the Täufer movement and described how Frell had obtained his ideas largely through reading the works of Hubmaier, one of the bona fide Täufer, who had played an important part in founding the movement which later became the Hutterite Brethren.³⁸ Frell had associates and supporters in Chur, but there is no evidence to indicate that any of them were Italian. It seems clear, therefore, that we are dealing here with a movement which was related to the sects we have called Täufer but that this movement had nothing to do with the radical Italian elements in the Leagues. The case points up the necessity to make distinctions between these rather obscure splinter movements of the Reformation.

From our study of radical Italian Protestants in the Leagues we may draw the following conclusions: many Italians fled to the Leagues to ensure the right to practice their religion freely. These men, in most cases, were sturdy and orthodox Christian evangelicals; but some among them, of humanistic training and outlook, and under the impact of antitrinitarian views, introduced a variety of subtle dogmatic heresies into the reformed congregations, especially in the Chiavenna area. Because one of their tenets deemphasized baptism and rejected infant baptism, they were commonly called "Anabaptists," an expression which had long served as a catch-all for diversified groups of non-conformist reformers and was consequently of more polemic than descriptive value. Non-conformist thinkers of the sixteenth century were called "Anabaptists" in their own day much as certain moderns whose deviation from orthodoxy lies in the politico-economic sphere are now spoken of as "Reds." Since secondary accounts have perpetuated this confusion down to recent years, it is high time for historians to set the movement in a clearer light and to bring about a cessation of the practice of speaking of the radical Italians as "Anabaptists."

North Italy.—In Venetia in the years around 1550 there flourished an evangelical movement whose radical teachings closely resemble those found in Raetia. Ever since Benrath and Comba studied the Inquisitorial documents which contain the history of this movement and accepted the convention of calling the participants "Anabaptists" most historians have followed their choice of terminology. Our study of the same materials will show the misleading character of this nomenclature.

The beginnings of the north Italian movement are associated with Tiziano, of whom we learn not only in the correspondence of the Raetian pastors with Bullinger but from four depositions made to the Inquisition by Pietro Manelfi.³⁹ After his conversion to Lutheranism

Tiziano visited Geneva and other "Lutheran" centers, and after his return from Switzerland he was teaching what Manelfi called "Anabaptist" doctrines.⁴⁰ Although Manelfi, followed by Wilbur,⁴¹ claims that Tiziano became an "Anabaptist" during his Swiss trip, all we may safely assert is that he probably came under Renato's influence there.

Upon his expulsion from the Leagues, Tiziano returned to Italy and while in Florence met Pietro Manelfi and acquainted him with his doctrines.⁴² Manelfi, who had been a Catholic priest, was working as a "Lutheran" missionary and it was in the course of one of his trips that he met Tiziano. He summarizes the latter's "Anabaptist" views as follows: the Gospel provides no support for infant baptism; magistrates cannot be Christians; the sacraments do not confer grace but are mere external signs; no doctrines should be held in the church save those contained in the Holy Scriptures, and the opinions of the doctors of the Church should be rejected; the Roman Church is devilish and anti-Christian, and anyone baptized in it is no true Christian unless he be rebaptized.⁴³ Manelfi accepted these doctrines but before long discovered that Christological controversies were developing in the congregation of "Anabaptists" at Vicenza, disputes which were so serious that a council had to be called to establish what was to be accepted as orthodox.

Manelfi believed that Tiziano was chiefly responsible for introducing "Anabaptism" into Italy,⁴⁴ and it is likely that there was a direct line from Renato to the Italian heretical movement.⁴⁵ However, Manelfi also claimed that Tiziano's doctrines were connected with the "opinion antique" of the "Anabaptists" of the north;⁴⁶ of these "old Anabaptist" teachings he specifically cites (1) the contention that Christians could not hold magistracies and (2) the assertion of the falsification of the chapters in the Gospels which contain the doctrine that Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit. There is some confusion in the testimony at this point. In describing the "old Anabaptist" opinions, one of which denied the right of a Christian to hold a magistracy, Manelfi says that such "Anabaptists" accepted Christ's divinity. In his very next paragraph, however, in giving further opinions of the "Anabaptists," he claims that they rejected certain passages in the Gospels because they violated the "Anabaptist" view that Christ was a man, born of the seed of Joseph. Evidently Manelfi spoke in one breath of different parties. He was trying to imply a connection between the early Täufer and the movement of which he had been a member; and in this attempt he slurred over the differences between these groups.

What is to be our conclusion about Tiziano's doctrinal position? His opinions certainly were not static, for they were in the process of development throughout the 1540's. At first a Catholic, he became a Lutheran under the influence of Ochino's teaching.⁴⁷ Then when he visited the Leagues and Cantons, he may have picked up ideas from the

Täufer; but it is more likely that his contacts in the Leagues were with the radical movement headed by Renato. Probably through Renato, although possibly by way of independent contacts with Servetians elsewhere, Tiziano finally added to his roster of beliefs the antitrinitarian and Christological heresies which he denounced in his recantation at Chur. But regardless of the source of his peculiar views, the simple appellation "Anabaptist" is completely misleading when it is applied to Tiziano. His ideas represent a compounding of several strains of religious thought and practice and are of such a nature that it is difficult to classify him according to traditional categories. The outstanding quality to be detected in his religious teachings is the stress he laid on the Spirit as the authoritative element in religious experience. This subjective tendency enabled him not only to discount the validity of the written word and to reject the practices of infant baptism but also to challenge the accepted Christian dogmas of the divinity of Christ, of the virginity of Mary, and of the Trinity.⁴⁸

Manelfi's depositions describe the council which met in Venice in the fall of 1550 to settle the Christological question for the radical evangelical communities of north Italy. Although the meetings contained delegations from congregations in the Cantons and Leagues as well as from Italy itself, we learn by examining the list of participants that it was a strictly Italian movement that was represented; and a study of the council's proceedings and conclusions confirms the supposition that the Täufer had nothing to do with it. The council, whose meetings remind one of Quaker assemblages, succeeded in coming to nearly unanimous agreement on the following points:

1. Jesus was not God but an exceptional man, the natural child of Joseph and Mary.

2. Mary had other sons and daughters after Jesus.

3. There are no angels.

4. There is no devil other than human prudence.

5. Resurrection at the last day is reserved for the elect alone.

6. There is no hell except the grave.

7. After death the souls of the elect sleep till the Day of Judgment.

8. The souls of the wicked die with their bodies.

9. Human seed has the God-given power to produce both body and soul.

10. The elect are justified by the eternal mercy and love of God without any visible works, thus without the death of Christ.⁴⁹

Benrath rightly stresses the influence of the thought of Camillo Renato, Tiziano, and other of the radical thinkers in the Raetian Leagues on the points formulated by the council.⁵⁰ Point seven had been foreshadowed in the teachings of Francesco Calabrese in the Engadine and was one of the tenets of Renato, while the tenth was also among

Francesco's heresies. It is interesting to find this doctrine of extreme predestination included in the list. In what evidence we have of Renato's beliefs, we find several other items in common with the council's conclusions. Mainardi's confession, which purports to condemn Renato's erroneous opinions, indicates that Renato was teaching views resembling those in the first, fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and tenth articles of the Venetian decisions. We may remind ourselves, also, that Tiziano was a proponent of the teaching contained in the first point, which implies a whole set of antitrinitarian and Christological heresies.

At the conclusion of the conciliar sessions the delegates appointed several men, including Manelfi and Tiziano, as "apostolic bishops" to inform the congregations of the results of the discussions. Manelfi admitted engaging in an active propaganda effort on behalf of the ten points during the year following the council, and we find Gallicius telling Bullinger in 1552 that there were doctrines of this type current in Italy.⁵¹ A long letter of Giulio da Milano dated May 24, 1551, and addressed to "una sorella in Italia" gives some details on the missionary activities of Manelfi and his fellow apostolic bishops,⁵² but it also treats of the whole problem of "Anabaptism"; it shows that Giulio was aware of the problems presented by the current movement in Venetia.⁵³ His criteria for calling a man or movement "Anabaptist" may be found in a list of "Anabaptist" opinions which Giulio appended to his collected correspondence. These opinions include the whole range of antitrinitarian teachings found at the Venetian council and in the Raetian Leagues.⁵⁴ It is evident that all these antitrinitarian heresies were linked to each other, whether they were found in northern Italy or in the Raetian Leagues.⁵⁵

Partly on the basis of the refusal of the Cittadella congregation to go along with the dogmatic radicals at Venice⁵⁶ and of the refusal of other groups, such as the community at Verona, to accept the teachings when they learned of them,⁵⁷ and partly on the basis of the later history of north Italian Protestantism, Benrath divides the Italian evangelic movement after 1550 into Lutheran, radical-dogmatic "Anabaptist," and moderate "Anabaptist" streams, which intercrossed each other confusingly during the next few years until the whole movement was liquidated by the Inquisition.⁵⁸ If we had more information on the Cittadella congregation and on the small group of dissenters at Verona, we might be able to trace some connections with the Täufer, but the story is unclear at this point. Benrath probably goes too far in applying terminology drawn from the northern reform movement to the Italian situation: he himself refrains from postulating connections between the Italian moderates and the Täufer, but it is easy to read such connections into his language and thereby to draw false conclusions.

All through the records of the Inquisitorial proceedings which led

to the effective destruction of the radical movement there is loose usage of the word "Anabaptism." This is the case, for example, with Don Giovanni Laureto, a one-time priest, who claimed in an undated confession that he had joined the "Anabaptists," had doubted the efficacy of Roman Catholic baptism, and had considered baptism to be no more than a surface token and therefore not necessary for salvation. "While I belonged to this sect," he said, "I doubted that Christ was true God and that he had been born of a Virgin; and I believed that the Gospels had been corrupted."⁵⁹ Similarly, Bartolomeo della Barba of Verona, when questioned by the Inquisition in 1551, abjured and in his abjuration summarized the views to which he had been exposed. These doctrines, which are almost identical with the points agreed upon at the Venetian council, had troubled Bartolomeo; and he had discussed them with other men in assemblies which had met for that purpose, assemblies which included the Venetian council in all likelihood.⁶⁰

After the Inquisition's first flurry of activity against the evangelicals in Venetia late in 1551, its persecution subsided and there is little information on the movement for several years. The documents which contain the account of the next appearance of radical religion in north Italy are, however, very interesting, for they bring us face to face with a number of Italian Protestants who with full justification may be classed among the Täufer. These men are the only Italians we know about who were really Täufer, but their numbers are so few that they may be dismissed as of little significance in any quantitative survey of the impact of the Reformation upon Italy. Still they are sufficiently interesting to justify a brief account at this place.

Our information on them comes from confessions and depositions made before the Inquisition by Giulio Gherlandi⁶¹ and Francesco della Sega.⁶² Both men were involved in the antitrinitarian movement and were left at a loss for the sort of religious associations which they desired after the Inquisition turned its weapons on the sectarians. Sometime after 1557, hearing of a Christian community in Moravia, they visited that land and joined the congregation of the Hutterite Brethren. Both men kept up contacts with their native country; it was during missionary trips in Italy that they were apprehended by the authorities, subjected to investigation, and finally executed by drowning. They are mentioned among the martyrs of the Täufer movement in the journals of the Hutterite Brethren.⁶³

We may summarize the evidence relating to radical evangelicalism in Venetia as follows: (1) Around 1550 a movement, the religious roots of which probably lay in a combination of rationalistically and humanistically derived interpretations of basic Christian ideas, Servetian teachings, and the characteristic elements of subjectivistic spiritual religion had acquired a small but comparatively significant following in

the Venetian region. (2) The movement at about this time was in the process of change in its doctrinal orientation. A radical faction, rejecting some traditional Christian dogmas, was growing rapidly; but there was also a small segment whose basic teachings and practices were marked by spiritual religious motives, possibly derived at secondhand from teachings of the Täufer but probably of independent growth; this group refused to give up the traditionally accepted Christian creeds. (3) After a period of persecution in 1551-52 the whole movement lost much of its impetus, its members either recanting, fleeing from Italy, or resorting to secret practice of their beliefs. (4) A few of the more conservative of these evangelicals found refuge in the communities of the Hutterite Brethren in Moravia; from there some of them emerged to engage in missionary work among their fellows in Italy. However, their arrest and imprisonment cut short the possibility that they might recruit any significant number of new members.

In the light of our guiding question, we must conclude from the history of north Italy's non-Lutheran evangelicalism that, despite the nearly universal use of the term "Anabaptism" in references to it, the only demonstrable contacts between this peculiar movement and the Täufer were of incidental significance.

Naples.—Several documents in the Venetian archives provide evidence for the existence of a Neapolitan radical evangelical movement, whose numerical importance was less than that of the northern development we have been discussing but which was doctrinally akin to it.⁶⁴ The proponents of radical doctrines in Naples were men who had some contact with the circle surrounding Juan Valdés. One of these radicals was Lorenzo Tizzano, who may be identical with that Tiziano whom we have met as an active missionary in the Raetian Leagues and north Italy. Tizzano left Naples for north Italy and ultimately surrendered to the Inquisition there. After giving himself up he prepared a statement which classified the different opinions he had met up with in Naples into categories which he called Lutheran, "Anabaptist," and "diabolical." For Tizzano the "Anabaptist" doctrines included the denial of Christ's eternal divinity and supernatural conception,⁶⁵ while "diabolical" opinions were the denial that Jesus was the Messiah, the teaching that men's souls die with their bodies and that only the elect are to be raised at the Last Judgment, and the assertion that some portions of the Scriptures are false.⁶⁶ Several of Tizzano's Neapolitan associates also fell into the hands of the Catholic authorities. Their depositions show that they were antitrinitarian but had no connections with the Täufer.⁶⁷ Giulio Basalu's deposition to the Venetian Inquisition supports this conclusion.⁶⁸

The Waldensians.—Due to certain resemblances between teachings of the Waldensians and of the Täufer, the question arises whether there

was any organic connection between these groups. L. Keller argues that the "Anabaptists" had their roots in continuations of medieval religious sects of the type of the Waldensians.⁶⁹ His contention is based primarily on the observation of similarities between the Täufer (especially the Swiss Brethren) and the old reform groups such as the Waldensians, the Bohemian Brethren, or various less formally constituted associations for the practice of religious piety. The mere fact of the existence of similarities does not suffice to show any connection, even though the likenesses extend to such common Täufer practices as the rejection of oaths, of war, of judicial execution, and of the holding of magistral office. These resemblances struck contemporaries less than they did later historians, for we find that both Waldensians and orthodox reformed Swiss leaders attempted to effect some kind of agreement or union between their groups. In these negotiations, which took place around 1530,⁷⁰ one can find no hint of a suspicion that the Waldensians were to be identified with the Täufer. It is clear that the early Swiss reformers, who were well able to recognize members of the Swiss Brethren when they met up with them, made no attempt to charge the Waldensians with connections with the Täufer.

Moravia.—Besides Gherlandi, della Sega, and some few other Italians who definitely identified themselves with the Hutterites, we have information about a number of other Italians who fled to Moravia. Their cases are, however, different, for they regarded Moravia as only a temporary refuge. In general, these Italians were, like the radical north Italians, antitrinitarians.

In the 1560's there was in Austerlitz a small Italian colony of men of this stripe who must, however, not be assumed to have been in association with the Hutterite settlements in the same town. Our principal information about this heretical group comes from a deposition made to the Venetian Inquisition in 1568 by one Marcantonio Varotto, who in the course of his wanderings came under the influence of Calvinist teachings in Geneva and of more radical evangelical doctrines in Austerlitz.⁷¹ At the latter place he met Niccolo Paruta, a man of some prominence in an antitrinitarian sect which was commonly known as the "Samosatians." Along with this group Varotto names ten other sects which were of significant proportions and had their own ministers. Varotto's description of the "Cappellarians" identifies them with the Hutterites, while the other "sects" apparently represented the more conservative Protestant groups or variations on the type of church which existed in north Italy. In any case Varotto's statement proves that Moravia had become a place of refuge for many unorthodox religious groups. It is clear that the security which that land offered to the Hutterites had also attracted a variety of other non-conformists, including antitrinitarian refugees from the Italian Inquisition. This very

situation requires us to exercise exceptional caution in dealing with the problem of Italians in Moravia, for the case of Paruta demonstrates that one could be an Italian in a town prominent for its Hutterite community and still be completely unconnected with that group. The same observation holds for the antitrinitarian exiles from Geneva, Alciati and Gentile,⁷² and for Bernardino Ochino, the famous preacher who was expelled from Zurich late in life for his indiscretion in discussing a number of heretical opinions in his *Dialogi XXX*. When Cantimori and Wilbur cite the cases of certain lesser figures who sought temporary refuge in Moravia, they speak of men who were friends of Paruta and definitely not of the Täufer camp.⁷³

Poland.—The indiscriminate application of the word "Anabaptism" to certain religious growths in Poland has been responsible for much confusion in the minds both of contemporaries and of later historians who have attempted to understand the character of the reform movement there. It is undeniable that there were Polish communities which practiced adult baptism; but an examination of their other beliefs and practices shows that there were important differences between Polish "Anabaptists" and Täufer of the type of the Swiss Brethren or Hutterites.⁷⁴ The very real difference between Polish "Anabaptists" and the Täufer were pointed up by an attempt which the Polish Minor Reformed Church made around 1568-70 to promote a union with the Hutterites in Moravia, a project at first looked upon favorably by the latter.⁷⁵ Conversations between the parties soon made plain to both sides the extent of the conflict in ideals and practices and led to an early abandonment of this foredoomed effort at union. The Hutterites found the Polish church's antitrinitarian and Christological doctrines little to their liking.

The importance for us of an understanding of the peculiar character of so-called Polish "Anabaptism" lies in the work of Italian liberal thinkers in the Polish reform movement. Such men as Lelio Sozzini, Francesco Stancari, Francesco Lismanino, Giorgio Biandrata, Giovan Paolo Alciati, and Valentino Gentile helped to give the Polish Minor Reformed Church its orientation; but there is no reason to conclude from that fact that these Italians had any contact with the Täufer.

Conclusions.—This survey of the areas in which one may discover a superficial indication of Italian contacts with the "Anabaptist" movement has made it clear that the use of the expression "Anabaptism" has been responsible for a vast amount of confusion in attempts to understand the nature of the original contribution of Italians to liberal religious thought. By asking and answering the question, "What contacts, if any, did Italian Protestants have with the Swiss Brethren, the Hutterites, or the Mennonites?" we are led to conclude that these contacts were limited to an extremely small area, that, namely, in which

a few Italians joined the Hutterite communities in Moravia. All of the other cases in which Italians are supposed to have been implicated with the "Anabaptist" movement actually refer to their relations with anti-trinitarianism. In this area of study, perhaps more than in any other phase of the Reformation, we need to distinguish carefully among the men and groups who composed the "left wing of the Reformation."

NOTES

- 1 The word "Täufer" means "baptizer" and consequently its use gives undue emphasis to baptism; however, since it lacks the unfortunate overtones of "Anabaptism," it may be employed with advantage.
- 2 See, e.g., the articles "Benadetto," "Benrath," "Cittadella," and "Ferrara" in the *Mennonitisches Lexikon*, ed. C. Hege and C. Neff (Frankfurt am Main and Weierhof [Pfalz], 1913-).
- 3 K. Benrath, "Wiedertäufer im Venetianischen um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, LVIII (1885), 9-67; *idem*, *Geschichte der Reformation in Venedig* (Halle: Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, 1887).
- 4 E. Comba, *I nostri protestanti*, Vol. II. *Durante la riforma nel Veneto e nell'Istria* (Firenze: Tip. e Libreria Claudiana, 1897).
- 5 *Idem*, "Un sinodo anabattista a Venezia anno 1550," *Rivista cristiana*, XIII (1885), 21-24, 83-87.
- 6 D. Berti, "Di Giovanni Valdes e di taluni suoi discepoli secondo nuovi documenti tolti dall'Archivio Veneto." *Atti della R. Accademia dei Lincei: anno CCLXXV, serie terza, memorie della classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, II (1877-1878), 61-81.
- 7 *Bullingers Korrespondenz mit den Graubündnern*, ed. T. Schiess, Vols. XXIII-XXV of *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte* (Basel, 1904-1906). Hereafter I cite this as *BK*, with volume numbers of the *BK* alone.
- 8 There is little doubt that Bartolomeo Maturo, an Italian preacher who was accused of inciting disturbances in the Valtellina in 1529, was only a moderate evangelical reformer; but some later historians have attempted to make him out to be a purveyor of radical doctrinal heresies. Cf. F. Trechsel, *Die protestantische Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin*, Book II, *Lelio Soczini und die Antitrinitarier seiner Zeit* (Heidelberg: Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1844), p. 73; Schiess, *BK*, I, lxx-lxxi; D. Cantimori, *Eretici italiani del cinquecento* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1939), pp. 50-51 (hereafter cited as *Eretici*).
- 9 P. D. Rosius de Porta, *Historia reformationis ecclesiarum Raeticarum* (Curiae Raetorum, 1771), I, Part I, 146.
- 10 U. Campell, *Historia Raetica*, ed. P. Plattner, Vol. IX of *Quellen zur Schweizer Geschichte* (Basel, 1890), pp. 298-299.
- 11 Schiess, *BK*, I, xxiv; Cantimori, *Eretici*, p. 52.
- 12 Cf. Mainardi's confession which lists the errors of Renato, in de Porta, *op. cit.*, I, Part II, 83-86; Trechsel, *op. cit.*, p. 93; Camillo Renato, "Trattato sul battesimo e sulla eucaristia di Camillo Renato," in *Per la storia degli eretici italiani del secolo xvi in Europa*, ed. D. Cantimori and E. Feist, No. 7 of *Reale Accademia d'Italia*, 1937, pp. 47-54.
- 13 Blasius to Bullinger, Chur, December 12, 1547, *BK*, I, No. 92.
- 14 Blasius to Bullinger, Chur, June 26, 1548, *BK*, I, No. 99; Renato to Bullinger, Chiavenna, September 21, 1548, *BK*, I, No. 101. Another prominent member of the Italian community who became involved in the dispute was Francesco Negri. Changeable in his attitude towards the questions at issue but in the long run orthodox, Negri gave Mainardi some uncomfortable moments. Cf. G. Zonta, "Francesco Negri l'eretico e la sua tragedia 'Il Libero Arbitrio.'" *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, LXVII, (1916), 265-324.
- 15 These appear in the tenth article of a confession, all of which is lost save this section. It is printed in de Porta, *op. cit.*, I, Part II, 83-86.
- 16 Mainardi to Bullinger, Chiavenna, May 15, 1549, *BK*, I No. 109; August 7, 1549, *BK*, I, No. 110. Pietro later denied that he had held "Anabaptist" opinions. Cf. his deposition to the Bolognese Inquisition printed in F. Chabod, "Per la storia religiosa dello stato di Milano, durante il dominio di Carlo V. Note e documenti," *Annuario del R. Istituto Storico Italiano per l'età moderna e contemporanea*, II-III (1936-37), Document No. 38, p. 204.
- 17 The Täufer however also spoke of the evil of infant baptism under the Church but without founding their demand for adult baptism on this alone. Cf. C. Pestalozzi, *Heinrich Bullinger: Leben und ausgewählte Schriften* (Elberfeld: R. L. Friderichs, 1858), pp. 42-43, citing Bullinger's pamphlet, "Von der Taufe und Kindertaufe" of 1525.

- 18 For example, see R. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Macmillan, 1914) and E. Troeltsch, *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*, trans. O. Wyon (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949), Vol. II. Pietro had been a friend of Giorgio Siculo, whom Cantimori calls a Servetian and "Anabaptist," *Eretici*, pp. 57ff, following an inference in a letter of the reformer Giulio da Milano; cf. Comba, *Protestanti*, p. 509. Study of Cantimori's analysis of Giorgio Siculo's writings reveals that this man was a spiritual reformer, whose emphasis on the spiritual permitted him to rationalize continued outward adherence to the old forms of religion but who had no connections with the Täufer.
- 19 Mainardi to Bullinger, Chiavenna, August 7, 1549, *BK*, I, No. 110. Cf. Comba, *Protestanti*, pp. 477-519; Gallicius to Bullinger, Chur, June 2 and 25, 1554, *BK*, I, No. 261, Letters 1 and 2; de Porta, *op. cit.*, I, Part II, 80.
- 20 The confession is to be found in the letter of Gallicius to Bullinger of June 25, 1554, cited above, n. 19. It is also printed in de Porta, *op. cit.*, I, Part II, 78-79.
- 21 It was taught by the Waldensians, for example; cf. H. Böhmer, "Waldenser," *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, ed. A. Hauck (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896-1913), XX, 827.
- 22 For the articles see Campell, *op. cit.*, pp. 333-334; also cf. de Porta, *op. cit.*, I, Part II, 101-103.
- 23 Mainardi to Bullinger, Chiavenna, August 4, 1550, *BK*, I, No. 130.
- 24 The confession is printed in Trechsel, *op. cit.*, Beilage II, pp. 409-414.
- 25 The case may be followed in letters to Bullinger by the Raetian pastors in *BK*, I.
- 26 Comander to Bullinger, Chur, April 5, 1552, *BK*, I, No. 181.
- 27 Chur, April 22, 1553, *BK*, I, No. 209.
- 28 Mainardi to Bullinger, Chiavenna, February 18, 1561, *BK*, II, No. 316; Trechsel, *op. cit.*, Beilage IV, pp. 415-416.
- 29 For the questions see, *ibid.*, Beilage V, No. 1, pp. 417-419.
- 30 Zanchi to Bullinger, Chiavenna, August 19, 1565, *BK*, II, No. 715.
- 31 D. Schmidt, "Girolamo Zanchi," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, XXXII (1859), 625-708.
- 32 To Zanchi we owe the apt saying: "Facile est divinare, unde hoc malum et per quos fotum: Hispanica gallina peperit Italia fovit ova: nos pipientes iam pullos audimus," *BK*, II, No. 715.
- 33 Lentulo to Church of Chur, Chiavenna, May 8, 1570, de Porta, *op. cit.*, I, Part II, 499-500; for the decree cf. *ibid.*, p. 501.
- 34 Fabricius to Bullinger, Chur, early December, 1561, *BK*, III, following No. 401.
- 35 Their names were Metzger and Frell.
- 36 Actually, when we speak of Chur, we must remember that we are dealing with a city which had few Italian residents; for we must recall that the bulk of the Italians in the Leagues, whether indigenous or fugitives, lived in the more isolated valleys to the south where Italian was spoken; and they came to Chur only for business, political, or ecclesiastical reasons, or because it was on their way to Zurich. It is not surprising, therefore, that we do not find Italians mentioned in the account of this incident.
- 37 Caspar Schwenckfeld of Silesia may best be described as a spiritual reformer of individualistic proclivities. He has often, though erroneously, been called an "Anabaptist." For an account of his life cf. S. G. Schultz, *Caspar Schwenckfeld von Ossig* (1489-1561) (Norristown, Pa.; Board of Publication of the Schwenckfelder Church, 1947).
- 38 Egli to Bullinger, Chur, May 23, 1570, *BK*, III, No. 202.
- 39 These are printed in Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista," *op. cit.*
- 40 *Ibid.* Deposition II, p. 83.
- 41 E. M. Wilbur, *A History of Unitarianism: Socinianism and its Antecedents* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 101.
- 42 Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista," Deposition I, p. 23.
- 43 *Ibid.*
- 44 *Ibid.*, Deposition II, p. 83.
- 45 In 1553 Vergerio informed Bullinger of the claim of some penitent "Anabaptists" in the Valtelline that Renato was responsible for all the "Anabaptism" in Italy, Vergerio to Bullinger, Vicosoprano, January 10, 1553, *BK*, I, No. 199, Letter 2.
- 46 Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista," Deposition II, p. 84.
- 47 *Ibid.*, Deposition I, p. 22.
- 48 Trechsel, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-83. An additional reason for believing that Tiziano had no contacts with Täufer in the Leagues is the fact that the Swiss Täufer were German-speaking while Tiziano, to our knowledge, had no command of that language.
- 49 Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista," Deposition I, p. 23; *idem*, *Protestanti*, pp. 495-496; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," *op. cit.*, pp. 24-25; *idem*, *Reformation in Venedig*, p. 80.
- 50 Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," p. 25.
- 51 Chur, February 29, 1552, *BK*, I, No. 179.
- 52 Comba, *Protestanti*, pp. 507-509.
- 53 *Ibid.*, p. 176, n. 2; pp. 498ff.
- 54 *Ibid.*, pp. 504-505.

- 55 Also cf. Comander to Bullinger, Chur, April 5, 1552, *BK*, I, No. 181; Vergerio to Bullinger, Vicosoprano, July 10, 1552, *BK*, I, No. 187, Letter 2; Comander to Bullinger, Chur, April 22, 1553, *BK*, I, No. 209.
- 56 Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista," *Deposition III*, p. 85.
- 57 *Ibid.*, *Deposition IV*, p. 87.
- 58 Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," p. 26.
- 59 Comba, *Protestanti*, pp. 491-492.
- 60 *Ibid.*, pp. 513-514.
- 61 *Ibid.*, pp. 557-587.
- 62 *Ibid.*, pp. 521-554.
- 63 J. Beck (ed.), *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer. Fontes Rerum Austriacarum*, XLIII (Vienna: Carl Gerold's Sohn, 1883), pp. 239-240, 211-212, 241-243.
- 64 Berti, *op. cit.*; L. Amabile, *Il Santo Officio della Inquisizione in Napoli*, Vol. I (Città di Castello: S. Lapi, 1892).
- 65 Berti, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
- 66 *Ibid.*, pp. 70-71.
- 67 Berti prints their depositions or the reports of their hearings.
- 68 Amabile, *op. cit.*, pp. 162-163.
- 69 L. Keller, *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1885); *idem*, *Die Anfänge der Reformation und die Ketzerschulen* (Berlin: R. Gaertner, 1897).
- 70 Comba, *Storia de' Valdesi* (Firenze: Tipografia Claudiana, 1893), pp. 83ff.
- 71 Professor R. H. Bainton has deposited a transcript of this statement in the Yale University Library: cf. "Venezia, Archivio di Stato, So. Officio, Busta No. 22: Varotta Marcantonio." I have used a photostat copy of this transcript, made available by the courtesy of Professor Bainton and the Yale Library.
- 72 When Gentile's biographer Aretius referred to his intercourse with "Anabaptists" in Moravia, he was thinking of other heretics than the Täufer. Cf. B. Aretius, *Valentini Gentilis, in Locis communes Christianae religionis* (Bernae Helvetiorum: le Preux, 1604), p. 570.
- 73 E.g., Cantimori, *Eretici*, pp. 311-312; Wilbur, *op. cit.*, p. 235, n. 51.
- 74 Interestingly enough, E. M. Wilbur, who uses a very general definition of "Anabaptism" when he speaks of antitrinitarian developments in Germany, Switzerland, and Italy, finds it necessary to make serious qualifications when he treats of Polish "Anabaptism." He says, "Despite some superficial similarities of practice there is no evidence of historical connection, [between Polish & Western anabaptism]," *op. cit.*, pp. 20ff.
- 75 The negotiations are described in *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder*, ed. R. Wolkan (Wien: Carl Fromme, 1923), pp. 339-343.

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM IN AMERICA, 1900-1920

By ROBERT T. HANDY

Union Theological Seminary

American Christian churches in the first three quarters of the nineteenth century were in general strongly conservative in social and economic outlook, and solidly supported the individualism of the time. But after the Civil War the swiftly and often painfully changing social scene stimulated widespread interest in economic and social matters and contributed to extensive rethinking of traditional views on the part of many Christians. Important reformist, progressive, and radical Christian social movements rose and agitated the churches.¹ Hence, when socialism grew with startling rapidity in the first decade and a half of the twentieth century, the attention of Christians was powerfully drawn to the new development. In that period when awareness of the social problem throbbed in the atmosphere of the time, that period of muckraking and trustbusting, progressivism and the sociological novel, the Socialist Party found rich soil in which to grow. The socialist vote grew from slightly over 400,000 in 1904 to some 900,000 in 1912, while party membership increased from 25,000 to 120,000 in the same period. By the latter date there were over one thousand socialists in elective positions across the land, most of them in minor posts, but with fifty mayors and twenty legislators included in the total.² This rapid growth raised in a new and urgent way the problem of the relationship that should exist between Christianity and socialism.

Both the friends and the opponents of socialism found the growth of the movement significant. Socialists were confident they would go from strength to strength, saying with Morris Hillquit, "the socialist movement has grown immensely within the last decade, and its growth still continues unabated in all civilized countries of the world."³ In a more exuberant mood, an American socialist entitled an article "Everywhere the Shout of Triumph" and declared:

Everywhere a million teeth are eating into the bulwarks of capitalism. Everywhere a million voices are awakening the social conscience. Everywhere the faith in old parties is being undermined.

It only remains for us to make our party worthy of confidence; to show our program practical, our organization efficient and the future is ours.

It is a wonderful opportunity. It is safe to say no Socialist movement in the world has ever faced such a wonderful opportunity as that we face here in America.⁴

However extravagant this may sound, the opponents of socialism were not inclined to minimize the startling development of the movement. Samuel Plantz, the president of Lawrence University and a bitter opponent of socialism, said:

. . . socialism is here and is one of the most significant movements of the modern age. It is now absorbing the attention of scholars, students of history, economists, statesmen, diplomats, and kings. The church also is awaking to its far-reaching import, and coming to see that its interests are vitally involved in the future of the movement.⁵

Many Christians and many socialists were satisfied that the traditional gulf between organized Christianity and political socialism was an unbridgeable one that could not or ought not be spanned. Christians of various denominations were alarmed by the atheism and materialism of Marx and other socialist leaders and troubled over their neglect of traditional ethical emphases. Many Protestant discussions of the problem of the relationship between Christianity and socialism included long quotations from socialist classics to illustrate the antipathy of the two. Harry Earl Montgomery, for example, gathered many quotations from socialist writers, such as Engels' "We have simply done with God" and Marx's "The abolition of religion as the deceptive business of the people is a necessary condition of their happiness," concluding: "The quotations seem to indicate that the teaching of Christ and the teaching of Socialism are absolutely and irreconcilably antagonistic."⁶ Many Protestants who were themselves ardent exponents of social reform and the social gospel nevertheless felt that socialism and Christianity were mutually exclusive. C. Bertrand Thompson in *The Church and the Wage Earners* declared,

The truth is that Christianity and socialism are diametrically opposite in method, aims, and spirit; that the Christian minister not only cannot support it consistently, but cannot even be in sympathy with it, and must oppose its extension for the same reason that he opposes the spread of pure materialism, or anything else which is entirely incompatible with the fundamental theses of his religion.⁷

Many Protestant ministers felt they had to oppose socialism because it was not only a political program or an economic theory, but presumed much more. In Dr. Charles Reed Zahniser's words,

It claims to be a gospel of human redemption from all the enthrallments that are found in social relations, and in these it also finds the causes of most shortcomings in individual characters, thereby entering the field where the Christian declares that the gospel of Christ is the only power of God unto salvation.⁸

The Roman Catholic attitude toward socialism, clearly expressed in a number of authoritative books, was aptly summed up by Father Bernard Vaughn: "Against Socialism, as it is, the Catholic Church has

resolutely set her face. She will have none of it."⁹ Some Catholic leaders felt that were socialism purely an industrial system, purely an economic matter, it might not be incompatible with the encyclicals, but added that this did not include the socialism then extant. Father John A. Ryan could say:

While a Catholic is not justified either in taking an active part in the present Socialist movement, or in accepting the scientific Socialist philosophy, he may, subject to the very improbable hypothesis that it would be practicable, believe in Essential Economic Socialism.¹⁰

Father Ryan noted that most Catholics who remained long in socialism soon ceased to practice their religion.

The gulf thus fixed between socialism and the churches was one which many socialists had no interest in minimizing. The socialist press frequently published material critical of religion and the churches.¹¹ An American socialist, John Macy, after reviewing attempts to show areas of agreement between socialism and Christianity, concluded, "... the Socialist is against organized religion, especially the most powerful organization of all, the Roman Catholic."¹² Officially the socialists declared that religion was a private matter, but that a deep hostility to religion and the churches characterized the attitude of many socialists was admitted.

Within the party there were those who were anxious to show that socialism and religion were not incompatible, that socialism had its spiritual side and could be given a spiritual interpretation. Chief among these was John Spargo, who had left the nonconformist ministry in England for leadership in socialism both there and here. Spargo devoted much of his writing to the theme that the association of atheism and socialism was altogether adventitious, the accidental result of the confluence of two separate streams of nineteenth century thought. But Spargo admitted that "... many very earnest Socialists will be among the first to repudiate the suggestion that their movement has a spiritual significance and may be interpreted in terms of spirituality."¹³ He insisted, however, that the anti-religious declarations of certain socialists must be taken as private utterances and not binding on the whole movement. Although he was interested in showing that religiously-motivated individuals could find a place in socialism, he showed little patience with organized Christianity as such. He said,

There is hatred for organized Christianity because it is believed to be false to the essential teachings of Jesus. The Church—Protestant and Catholic—has been judged and found wanting.¹⁴

Even the socialists who were anxious to show that socialism and religion were not incompatible did little to bridge the gulf between the

party and the churches, for their faith tended to be in humanity or in socialism as the new religion rather than in doctrines specifically Christian.

Ever since Kingsley and Maurice had done their work in England in the mid-nineteenth century, there were those few who claimed to bridge the gulf between Christianity and socialism and went by the name of "Christian socialist." In the 1890's there was a considerable growth of this movement in the United States. But it was at best an unstable and unsatisfactory attempt, for the Christian socialists were often viewed with suspicion on both sides, and not a little effort was expended to show that really no such thing was possible. Father Vaughn declared that Christian socialism was a contradiction in terms, a form of collectivism repudiated by all thoroughgoing socialists. President Plantz insisted that the so-called Christian socialists were not really socialists at all, for they did not teach a single principle peculiar to socialism. Indeed, the Christian socialism of the 1890's was a very broad social philosophy of gradualism with its rationale first in religion, second in ethics, and only incidentally in scientific socialism.¹⁵ Never very successful, the disappearance of the little societies and journals of Christian socialism served to emphasize the distance between socialism and the churches.

After the turn of the century a fresh attempt to bridge the gulf between the two movements was made. Many Christians came to see truth in Walter Rauschenbusch's remark that

Christianity and Socialism are the oldest and the youngest of the idealistic forces at work in our civilization. The future lies, not with those who choose either of the two and reject the other, but with those who can effect the completest amalgamation of the two.¹⁶

The term "Christian socialist" was still applied to the newer movement; and its leading journal was named *The Christian Socialist* and its leading organizational expression was "The Christian Socialist Fellowship." But the use of the same term for both movements was and is misleading, for it obscures the fact that the twentieth century movement was quite different in character from the earlier Christian socialism. The new movement was dominated by Christians who were frankly political socialists, often dues-paying, working members of the Socialist Party, professing to accept precisely the doctrines the earlier Christian socialists had shied away from: the economic interpretation of history and the class struggle. A better term for them than "Christian socialist" would be some such awkward phrase as "Christians and socialists" or "Christians in socialism." They were quite conscious of their difference from the earlier Christian socialists. As Professor Vida Scudder, one of their leading spokesmen, put it, "Christian Socialism" draws un-

to itself sentimentalists, cranks, and an occasional stray saint or philosopher, but organized socialism and organized religion agree in ignoring it."¹⁷ Rufus Weeks, prominent lay leader in the new movement, stated its main tenets in unequivocal terms:

Better a small band, holding a straight-out, unambiguous position, than even a large society with a vague platform. We should make it perfectly plain that religiously we are with the churches, and politically with the actually militant Socialists, holding to an economic determinism and the class interest, and the class conscious appeal to the working class.¹⁸

Moreover the group professed to be informed by Marxian sources more than the earlier Christian socialists had been. They turned from the favorite authors of the earlier movement to focus on more distinctly Marxian writings. Professor Scudder proclaimed:

Tolstoy, Ruskin, Ibsen, were all on the wrong tack. Close these authors; open your Engels, your Bebel, your Jaurès, and, even though you may not agree with their doctrines, enjoy to the full the relief afforded by their method and attitude.¹⁹

An early student of Christian socialism expressed the difference between the older and the newer movements in a sentence: "The point of difference between the Christian Socialism of Maurice and that of the [Christian Socialist] Fellowship is that the former hoped to win Socialism to Christian life and thus to solve the economic and industrial problems, whereas the latter hoped to win Christianity to Socialism and in this way to solve these same problems."²⁰ The Christians who entered socialism in the early years of the twentieth century thus bridged the gulf between Christianity and socialism, adding to their religious faith a political faith, and finding them not only compatible but indeed necessary to each other.

In numbers, the Christians in socialism were small, but they were a significant and aggressive minority fairly well co-ordinated. In 1903 the Rev. Edward Ellis Carr, a Methodist who had withdrawn from his denomination to become pastor of a "People's Church" and had joined the Socialist Party, began publication of a little journal entitled *The Christian Socialist*. The Christian Socialist Fellowship was organized in 1906, stimulated by repeated suggestions in the columns of the paper. Among the avowed objectives of the Fellowship was the following:

Its object shall be to permeate the churches, denominations, and other religious institutions with the social message of Jesus; to show that Socialism is the necessary economic expression of the Christian life; to end the class struggles by establishing industrial democracy and to hasten the reign of justice and brotherhood upon earth.²¹

The history of the fellowship has been admirably summarized by Dr.

Charles Howard Hopkins in his *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism*. It grew to considerable size and influence. Its bi-monthly journal became quite widely circulated; its editors could boast "OVER FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND COPIES OF THE CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST WERE CIRCULATED DURING THE YEAR 1909, MORE THAN THREE HUNDRED THOUSAND OF WHICH WENT TO REGULAR SUBSCRIBERS."²²

At the Fourth General Conference of the Fellowship some five hundred active and five hundred associate members were reported; included in the membership were a number of prominent pastors, seminary teachers, and laymen representing many denominations. Their articles and reports of their activities fill the pages of *The Christian Socialist*. The Fellowship was interdenominational, but some of its members who were members of the Protestant Episcopal Church were also members of "The Church Socialist League" which was organized in 1911. Its membership included such prominent figures as Bishops Spalding, Jones and Brewster, Professor Scudder, and the Rev. Bernard Iddings Bell. The League, which advocated political socialism, was fairly influential, for a contemporary evaluation of the Episcopal Church in relation to socialism reported:

A considerable share of the clergy are tinctured with socialism. With but 6,000 clergy, several hundred are avowed socialists and nearly one hundred are members of the Socialist Party. The League is able to present the parallel demands of militant socialism to this communion as no other society can.²³

In addition to the work of these two societies, there was some experimentation with socialist churches, such as the Rev. Bouck White's "Church of the Social Revolution" in New York City, which felt itself to be to the Socialist Party what the soul is to the body, and sought to summon socialism out of the low ground of a purely materialistic program.²⁴ In general, however, the Christians in socialism found it most expedient to remain in the pulpits and positions where they were, though some pastors by choice and some by necessity left the ministry to undertake full time work in the socialist movement.

The total impact of this movement was such that by the time of the first World War George H. Strobell could say, "... there are hundreds of clergymen and thousands of church members avowed Socialists and many are members of the party organization and assist in its councils and propaganda."²⁵

In view of the traditional gulf that continued to exist between Christianity and socialism of all this time, it is important to ask why a not inconsiderable group of Christians could boldly bridge the gulf and so warmly support the Socialist Party. It is not enough to point out that the ethical sensitivities of such people were touched by the poverty,

slum, and miserable conditions of labor that were all too evident—many a Christian was aware of these and anxious to eradicate them who was never attracted to socialism. Nor is it enough to say that their interest in the historical Jesus and his social teachings led them to socialism—many liberals who proclaimed the social ideals of the historical Jesus did not find that they led to socialism at all. It is necessary to discover a religious and theological motivation that permitted them to remain sincere Christians and yet espouse a political movement distasteful to the majority of their fellow churchmen.

II.

The key to understanding this movement of Christians into socialism is the identification that was made between the coming kingdom of God and the socialist state to be inaugurated by the Socialist Party; this identification provided the religious and theological basis for Christian commitment to political socialism. The concept of the coming kingdom of God on earth dominated large areas of Protestant thought, particularly liberal Protestant thought, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; various streams contributed to this emphasis, among which the work of Ritschl and Maurice were especially important. To be sure the earlier Christian socialists before 1900 had in a vague way identified the coming kingdom with the goals of socialism. Characteristically, the Rev. W. D. P. Bliss, prominent early Christian socialist leader, had stressed the kingdom theme in his writings and indicated that Christian socialism would support all changes pointing to the goal. Somewhat more pointed were the suggestions of some socialists before 1900 to the effect that the kingdom of God on earth would come with the inauguration of the socialist state. The pioneer figure in this was Laurence Gronlund, widely-read socialist author who did much to popularize socialism in America. Gronlund's socialism was a broad, evolutionary, democratic socialism, carefully labelled collectivist rather than communist. His sources were not primarily Marxian, for his writings were based on a wide reading of such men as Joseph Mazzini, J. S. Mill, Henry George, and Thorold Rogers. Gronlund's chief work was named *The Co-operative Commonwealth*, and that phrase fills the literature of Christian socialism before and after 1900. In the preface to the 1890 edition of this book, Gronlund declared:

Everything is ripe, especially in the United States, for the great change, except leaders. I am convinced they will come out from among the deeply religious minds among us. What is needed is to convince them that this coming change is God's will; that the society to be ushered in is not a pig-sty, filled with well-fed pigs, but is, indeed, the Kingdom of Heaven on earth . . . ²⁰

In that same year, 1890, Gronlund published another work in which the identification of the kingdom of God with the co-operative commonwealth of the socialists was further stressed:

Again, the "Kingdom of Heaven" which Jesus meant was, without a particle of doubt, first and last a society on earth, with other social conditions, where the prevailing cruel social injustice should be redressed. . . . Here it is that Socialism will supplement Christianity: as Jesus divided the new world from the old by proclaiming the Kingdom of Heaven, the brotherhood of man, so Socialism will realize them.²⁷

That his socialism was mild and somewhat utopian is evident in that it provided the chief inspiration for Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, as well as contributing much to the earlier Christian socialism. Gronlund's writings exerted considerable influence upon the Rev. George D. Herron, leading Christian social prophet of the 1890's, whose preaching focussed around the kingdom theme.²⁸ Gronlund became an officer in a little Christian socialist society on the west coast, a society related to Herron's "Kingdom movement."²⁹

Gronlund's identification of the kingdom of God and the socialist state was fairly general in that he did not name a particular socialist party as the instrument by which the co-operative commonwealth was to be inaugurated. Around the turn of the century a more precise identification was made with a Marxian socialist party specifically named. J. Stitt Wilson, young Methodist pastor and social settlement worker, was deeply troubled by the social tension and conditions in the Chicago area. Guided by Herron, whom he greatly admired, Wilson searched his Scripture and came to the conclusion that the Carpenter of Nazareth had come ". . . to establish the Kingdom of the Good in the Earth."³⁰ He resigned his pulpit and with a few faithful followers launched a "Social Crusade" in 1898. The aim of the little group was to win adherents to a "full Christianity" that included the social as well as the individual message of redemption. With great earnestness Wilson and his associates preached night after night, often in the open, combining religious with social themes in their fiery messages. The Crusaders emphasized both the kingdom of Heaven on earth and the necessity of socialism. But the advocacy of socialism was not left in generalities, for the Crusaders urged support of the International Socialist Labor Party. Notices like the following appeared frequently in their little journal:

There is but one party that fills the requirements of labor today. That party is the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY.³¹

The weakness in any such attempt to specify a given socialist party as the bringer of the kingdom was the divisiveness of American political socialism into a number of competing groups in the closing years of the nineteenth century. Accordingly the Christians interested in socialism worked for socialist unity and contributed to it.³² In the summer of 1901 a Unity Convention was held at Indianapolis, out of which came the

Socialist Party of America. This immediately became the major and rapidly-growing socialist party; the Socialist Labor Party survived but its membership and influence remained distinctly minor. The Socialist Party was fairly broad from the start. Several strands of socialist life combined in the formation of the party. One important element was an offshoot from the Socialist Labor Party; it retained a somewhat Marxian emphasis. Another strand came out of what Hillquit labelled "... an indigenous though somewhat vague Socialist movement that sprang up as a sort of a cross breed between certain surviving radical elements of Populism and the remnants of the American Railway Union ..."³³ It was with this group that Eugene Debs came into the Socialist Party; it is instructive to observe that among the influences leading him to adopt socialism while serving a prison term were the works of Gronlund and Bellamy.³⁴ The party was not narrowly doctrinaire; indeed, party leaders who wished both to claim that the party was correctly Marxian and yet not narrowly doctrinaire provided ingenious explanations. John Spargo, for example, indicated that the influence of Marx as the statesman and tactician of the working class was increasing as his influence as a theorist was declining, for critical study had forced abandonment of some of his theories and modification of others.³⁵ Within such a Socialist Party a few Christians felt from the beginning that they had found a political home. Some of them were present at the Unity Convention, among them the Rev. William H. Wise and the Rev. James H. Hollingsworth of the Social Crusade. Soon an increasing number of Christians found a place in the Socialist Party; it became the focus of loyalty for most of the Christians in socialism. Many of the earlier Christian socialists were drawn into the new party; significantly, when the periodical *The Social Gospel* representing the earlier Christian socialism discontinued in 1901, unfilled subscriptions were rounded out with copies of the *International Socialist Review*. A small but growing number of Christians began to hope that the kingdom might come through the instrumentality of the Socialist Party.

The movement of Christians into socialism was slowed and almost halted in the early years of this century by the Herron affair. Herron had joined the Social Crusade very early in 1901, having openly espoused socialism. A few months later he was divorced by his wife and the blame for the incident was laid on Herron. He speedily remarried, was deposed from the Congregational ministry, and soon thereafter he renounced Christianity. He was a prominent figure in the Socialist Party in its early years; he was temporary chairman of the Unity Convention and drafted the manifesto that led to social unity. But the divorce, remarriage, defection from Christianity, and vituperation of the churches in which he indulged seemed to illustrate to the opponents of socialism precisely the gulf that lay between it and Christianity, and they were

not at all reluctant in pointing it out. The Herrons were hounded by the press until finally they left the country to take up permanent residence abroad. The reaction of the churches to the Herron episode was so great that it was extremely embarrassing to socialist Christians; even those who had been decisively influenced by Herron later rarely mentioned him.³⁶ The shock of the incident destroyed the Social Crusade, but it did not destroy the identification that had been proposed between the kingdom of God and the socialist state that was to come through the instrumentality of the Socialist Party. On the basis of this identification *The Christian Socialist* and the Christian Socialist Fellowship undertook their activities, and discouraged members of the Social Crusade, chiefly J. Stitt Wilson, Carl D. Thompson, and William T. Brown, were to find a large place in the new movement.

A 1918 editorial in the journal of the Church Socialist League briefly reviewed socialist Christian history, explaining the enthusiasm and ardor of the early Christians in socialism in the following words:

At the beginning of this century a few Christians here and there became convinced that the socialists, so far from being the criminal outcasts or dangerous fools that all the respectable had supposed, were really on the right track and not so very different from the founders of the original Church, Jewish and Christian; and that the regime of universal co-operation they looked forward to is substantially the old Kingdom of Heaven in modern terms. These Christians, overcome with the wonder and joy of their discovery, hastened to share it with their trusted fellow Christians, clergy and lay, confident that these who so fervently loved Christ would gladly welcome the new light and follow where the real Jesus led.³⁷

The "discovery" formed the basis of the appeal of the Christians in socialism to their fellows. As George H. Strobell expressed it,

*For the first time in the history of the world there is an intelligent and systematic movement toward the conscious organization of a just society. It is the Socialist movement, now on its way to a speedy triumph in all civilized nations.*³⁸

The Christians in socialism found that their concept of the realization of the kingdom through socialism not only opened the door to hearty co-operation with the Socialist Party, it also led them to show that socialist emphases stemmed from the teaching of Jesus and that therefore socialism was Christian. As the Rev. William H. Ward, secretary of the Christian Socialist Fellowship in 1910, expressed it:

If Jesus was right, Socialism is right; for it is true to the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount, and an attempt to realize His ideal. All Socialists may not give Him credit for the ideal, but, nevertheless, He had the same ideal and, judged by Christian standards, Socialism is Christian in principle, purpose and practice. We have been taught that, in the fulness of time, there would be a NEW EARTH WHEREIN DWELLETH RIGHTEOUSNESS and the kingdoms of this world would become God's kingdoms. The time is near. Re-

pent, the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. Come out for Christian Socialism. It is God's call. The work has begun. We are going to establish a system of justice and love.³⁹

The complementary nature of Christianity as taught by Christ and of socialism in its twentieth century American guise was the theme of the great majority of contemporary articles on the topic of Christianity and socialism. The veteran Christian social leader, R. Heber Newton, summed up what many were saying in a sentence: "... Socialism is an economic movement which sorely needs the Christian forces, and Christianity is an institute of religion which as sorely needs the Socialistic functionings."⁴⁰ Socialism as the true meaning of Christianity practically applied was another favorite theme of Christians in socialism. As the Rev. Albert Ehrhrott told the Baptist Ministers of Cleveland:

Most of you don't know what Socialism is. You don't know that it is only practical Christianity. You don't know that Socialism is the very thing above all others that you ought to be preaching from your pulpits. . . . It is but the practical interpretation of the sermon on the Mount. It is the golden rule, not talked about, but applied.⁴¹

A European book enthusiastically welcomed and popularized by the American Christians in socialism because it reinforced their central theme was Herman Kutter's *They Must*. Kutter in his vigorous style insisted that the kingdom of God was coming through socialism. He felt that God was working, not in the Christian social reformers nor in the conservatives, but in the Social Democrats. Kutter's book in translation appeared in an American edition edited by Rufus Weeks, who noted that it was the first widely-published proclamation of the "great identification," that "... the Kingdom of God proclaimed by Jesus and the Co-operative Commonwealth foreseen and willed by the Socialists, are one and the same."⁴²

The Christians in the Socialist Party came from a number of denominations and were not at all of one theological stripe; some were essentially Evangelicals while others were informed by a more classical Protestant tradition; all were influenced to some degree by liberal currents. In general they were Christians in a more ultimate sense than they were socialists. They were socialists because they felt that socialism was a valid and correct application of Christian principles; they explained socialism in terms of Christianity rather than the reverse. This appeared clearly when the Christian Socialist Fellowship was threatened internally by a group which sought to minimize the specifically Christian emphasis of the Fellowship. E. E. Carr spoke for the majority when he said, "If the 'Social Message of Jesus' applied to an age of machinery does not mean Socialism, no orthodox Christian can ever consistently be a Socialist; for Christians must stand by the Hero of the

Cross, their Savior."⁴³ In general, the Christians in socialism did not go very far in exploring either the theological depths of their own faith in relation to socialism or the theoretical foundations of socialism. In this they reflect the reaction against theology evident in Protestantism early in the twentieth century as well as a certain superficiality and naiveté in their social thinking. A remark like Strobell's oft-quoted "The materialist conception of history—economic determinism—is only another name for the 'determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God'"⁴⁴ shows an oversimplification quite characteristic of the movement. The great concern of the Christians in socialism with the coming kingdom led them to neglect the doctrine of the church. They agreed with Washington Gladden that "... the kingdom of God is greater than the church and that the superior allegiance of every disciple of Christ is to the kingdom and not to the church."⁴⁵ Quite expressive of the attitude toward the church was an editorial in the Church Socialist League's organ, which criticized the human limitations of the Church, excoriated it for becoming so much part and parcel of the capitalist system, and urged the Church to take a leading role in the struggle for social righteousness—the Church was viewed as an instrument to the end of social justice and the coming of the kingdom.⁴⁶ The most thoughtful attempt to analyze profoundly the relationship between socialism and Christianity was Vida Scudder's *Socialism and Character*, an interpretation of socialism in terms of Christian theology. Although Miss Scudder was too good a theologian not to know that the consummation of the kingdom was not to be in time but in eternity, she so stressed the co-operative commonwealth as an important step in the coming of the kingdom that her theological distinction did not at all weaken her whole-hearted support of political socialism or her vigorous writing on its behalf. The work bore the stamp of its time, stressing the kingdom instead of the church, the immanent rather than the transcendental idea of God. By her own admission the work was premature, and attracted but few readers.⁴⁷

The movement had some impact on the Socialist Party as well as on the churches. The party had its own right and left wings, and Christians were generally found strengthening the right wing, stressing the gradual, peaceful, political spread of socialism.⁴⁸ J. Stitt Wilson served for a time as a member of the Socialist Party's five-man executive committee. The efforts of the Christians in socialism did much to mitigate the antipathy toward the churches that so often marked socialist movements. When Eugene Debs spoke before the 1908 conference of the Christian Socialist Fellowship he said:

A few years ago, a meeting like this would have been impossible. . . . I am glad I can call you ministers of the Man of Galilee my comrades, for it isn't long ago that I felt a great prejudice against you as a class.⁴⁹

Debs showed that many socialists were in sympathy with the identification of the kingdom of God with the co-operative commonwealth when he wrote a Christmas "comment on Christ's words" entitled "Suffer the Little Children to Come Unto Me." He said:

Jesus taught that the earth and the air and the sea and sky and all the beauty and fulness thereof were for all the children of men; that they should all equally enjoy the riches of nature and dwell together in peace, bear one another's burdens and love one another, and that is what Socialism teaches and why the rich thieves who have laid hold on the earth and its bounties would crucify the Socialists as those other robbers of the poor crucified Jesus two thousand years ago.⁵⁰

All of this helps us to understand the much-debated Article II, Section 6 of the party's constitution, adopted in 1912, which provided that any party member who opposed political action or advocated crime, sabotage or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working class in its emancipation was to be expelled from party membership. The right wing of the party was strengthened by the activity of the Christians in socialism; many vigorous contributions to socialist propaganda before the first World War were made by them.⁵¹

That the movement had a significant impact on the life of the churches has already been indicated to some extent; it succeeded as no previous movement had in narrowing the gulf between socialism and Christianity. It certainly had no wide and sweeping success: one of the proponents of the movement thus records the disappointment of those converts to political socialism as they tried to win their fellow Christians: "The leading clergymen and laymen stared at their enthusiasm with superior smiles, meeting their arguments with timid objections or with more deadly silence."⁵² Of course not all the opposition was as uninformed or as superficial as this. More searching criticism was applied to their movement: Charles Reed Zahniser, for example, contended in a careful analysis that the economic principles of socialism could not easily be separated from its original metaphysical assumptions without leaving an inadequate and unstable program or producing something other than socialism.⁵³ Walter Rauschenbusch himself, though a supporter of the Christian Socialist Fellowship and an editorial writer for *The Christian Socialist*, had important reservations concerning the identification of the kingdom with the socialist state and never himself became a member of the Socialist Party. For him Christian socialism was always "a peculiar genus of Socialism," and, though he was attracted by the stress on social justice that marked socialism, he was chary of the "alloy" with which the moral elements were fused in socialism.⁵⁴ But Rauschenbusch was characteristic of many Christian leaders who had certain reservations as they considered socialism and yet regarded it with a friendly eye. Certain denominational social service commissions,

in particular the Methodist Federation for Social Service, were influenced by the Christian socialist movement.

III.

The coming of the first World War led to inner tensions both in the party and in the Fellowship which contributed to the decline of the first and the disappearance of the second. The events of the war period shattered the identification between kingdom hope and socialist reality, and with its center destroyed the movement that has been traced in this paper disintegrated. The Socialist Party early took a stand against the war and against American entry. A strong minority of the party withdrew over that issue, sharply criticized the party for its "pacifism" and "Prussianism," organized a new social movement and turned to other political channels.⁵⁵ The party was thus shorn of important right wing elements, where the socialist Christians had been most at home. But they also tended to follow the churches in general in support of the war; only a few of them retained a pacifist position. *The Christian Socialist* came out strongly for the war, and finally found it expedient to change its name to *Real Democracy* in the fall of 1918. The editor said, "While many of us cling affectionately to the dear old name, *The Christian Socialist*, many others insist that a new name, in view of the changes produced by the war, would be better; and even many who love the old name best agree that in the new circumstances another name would be better."⁵⁶ He added that though the journal still sought the goal of socialism, more rational attention would henceforth be given to the steps leading to it. The renamed journal was soon congratulating itself that it had seen the right side of the war, and the editor revealed considerable reorientation with respect to the Socialist Party when he now labelled it "... a bigoted, bitter, unscientific, foolish, anti-religious sect."⁵⁷ The Christians in socialism were not now very sure that the Socialist Party was the instrument of the kingdom.

Following rapidly the excitement over the war issue emerged a new and even more perplexing one over the relationship of the party to the Russian Revolution. Briefly, in 1919 the left wing groups of the Socialist Party withdrew to form several communist parties, and party membership dropped from some 100,000 to about 27,000 in 1920, and by 1931 the number had fallen below 14,000. The antisocialist reaction that swept the country after the war greatly contributed to the unpopularity and weakness of the party. The socialist Christian groups were also perplexed over the attitude that should be taken to the Russian Revolution.⁵⁸ Confused by the socialist decline and weakened by the antisocialist reaction, the Christian socialist societies and publications disappeared in the early 1920's. The "great identification" had failed, and the Christians looked elsewhere, and placed their hope in other movements.

The movement was not without its lasting effects. It was a Presbyterian minister who was to be the standard bearer for the Socialist Party for three decades. In the stress of depression years came a considerable revival of socialist Christian activity. Further, the work of the Christians in socialism contributed greatly to the spread of the social gospel and to the Protestant concern with social and economic issues. Walter Rauschenbusch suggested the wide impact of the movement in reporting that "... the spread of diluted Socialist ideas on many religious leaders has been one of the most fruitful religious influences of the last forty years."⁵⁹ Miss Scudder could print with some satisfaction as evidence of the spread of progressive ideas a report of the Commission on the Church and Social Service to the Quadrennial meeting of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in December, 1916, which read in part as follows:

Christian democracy applied to industry means the development of cooperative relations to the fullest possible extent. The Church should therefore clearly teach the principle of the fullest possible cooperative control and ownership of industry and the natural resources upon which industry depends, in order that men may be spurred to develop the methods that should express this principle.⁶⁰

Thus the movement of Christians in socialism contributed significantly to the molding of Christian thought in a social ethical direction for a long generation, and study of it helps in the understanding of the mood of Protestantism in America in the early decades of the present century.

- 1 Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1949); Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* ("Yale Studies in Religious Education," Vol. XIV [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940]).
- 2 Jessie Wallace Hughan, *The Facts of Socialism* (New York: John Lane Co., 1913), pp. 47-49.
- 3 *Socialism in Theory and Practice* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1913), p. v.
- 4 Carl D. Thompson, *The Christian Socialist*, February 1, 1910, p. 2.
- 5 *The Church and the Social Problem* (Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham, 1906), pp. 113 f.
- 6 *Christ's Social Remedies* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911), pp. 77, 89, 107.
- 7 *The Church and the Wage Earners* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), pp. 125 f.
- 8 *Social Christianity: The Gospel for an Age of Social Strain* (Nashville: The Advance Publishing Co., 1911), p. 81.
- 9 *Socialism from the Christian Standpoint: Ten Conferences* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912), p. 41. Cf. also John J. Ming, *The Characteristics and the Religion of Modern Socialism* (New York: Benziger Bros., 1908), and *The Morality of Modern Socialism* (New York: Benziger Bros., 1909).
- 10 "May a Catholic Be a Socialist?" *The Christian Socialist*, February 15, 1909, p. 2.
- 11 E.g., *The New York Call* of March 2, 1911, declared that "the theory of economic determinism alone, if thoroughly grasped, leaves no room for a belief in the supernatural." Quoted by John Spargo, *Marxian Socialism and Religion* (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1915), p. 85 n.
- 12 *Socialism in America* (Garden City: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1916), p. 115.
- 13 *Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism* (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1908), p. 20.
- 14 *Marxian Socialism and Religion*, p. 171.
- 15 Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism*, pp. 182 f. Cf. also J. Dombrowski, *The Early Days of Christian Socialism in America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), and Paul F. Laubenstein, "A History of Christian Socialism in America" (Unpublished S.T.M. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1925).
- 16 *The Christian Socialist*, March 15, 1914, p. 5.

- 17 *Socialism and Character* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1912), p. 73.
- 18 *The Christian Socialist*, July 15, 1905, quoted in Laubenstein, "A History of Christian Socialism," p. 55.
- 19 *Socialism and Character*, p. 133.
- 20 Leo Jacobs, *Three Types of Practical Ethical Movements of the Past Half Century* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1922), p. 33.
- 21 *The Christian Socialist*, May 15, 1909, p. 1.
- 22 *Ibid.*, February 1, 1910, p. 5.
- 23 *The Social Preparation for the Kingdom of God*, January, 1918, p. 11.
- 24 *Letters from Prison: Socialism a Spiritual Sunrise* (Boston: Richard A. Badger, 1915).
- 25 *A Christian View of Socialism* (Girard, Kansas: Appeal to Reason, 1917), p. 5.
- 26 *The Co-operative Commonwealth* (Boston; Lee & Shepard, 1903), p. viii.
- 27 *Our Destiny: The Influence of Nationalism on Morals and Religion* (Boston: Lee & Shepard, 1901), p. 177.
- 28 Cf. Robert T. Handy, "George D. Herron and the Kingdom Movement," *Church History*, XIX (June, 1950), 97-115.
- 29 William Rader, "The Oakland Institute of Applied Christianity," *The Kingdom*, VIII (1895-96), 454.
- 30 "How I Became a Socialist," *The Christian Socialist*, September 15, 1910, p. 1.
- 31 "An Appeal to the Working Classes," "The Social Crusader, March 15, 1899 pp. 12, 14.
- 32 E.g., Herron late in 1900 spoke to a mass meeting of Chicago socialists on "A Plea for the Unity of American Socialists," *The International Socialist Review*, I (1900-01), 327.
- 33 *Loose Leaves from a Busy Life* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934), p. 48.
- 34 Harry W. Laidler, *Social-Economic Movements* (New York: T. Y. Crowell, 1948), p. 583 n.
- 35 *Sidelights on Contemporary Socialism* (New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1911), p. 154.
- 36 E.g., cf. J. Stitt Wilson, "George D. Herron, D. D., A Biographical Sketch," *The Social Crusader*, January, 1901, pp. 8-12, in which the decisive influence of Herron on his development was stressed, with his "How I Became a Socialist," *The Christian Socialist*, September 15, 1910, pp. 1 f., in which Herron is not even mentioned.
- 37 *Social Preparation for the Kingdom of God*, October, 1918, pp. 12 f.
- 38 *A Christian View of Socialism*, p. 11.
- 39 "Has the Church Failed?" *The Christian Socialist*, September 1, 1910, p. 4.
- 40 "The Relation of Socialism to Christianity," *The Christian Socialist*, August 1, 1909, p. 1.
- 41 *Ibid.*, September 1, 1909, p. 3.
- 42 *They Must: or God and the Social Democracy, A Frank Word to Christian Men and Women* (Chicago: Co-operative Printing Co., 1908), p. 8.
- 43 *The Christian Socialist*, April 1, 1909, p. 4. Jacob's estimate of the Fellowship as "... a counter move of Socialists to capture the Church for Socialism" (*Three Types of Practical Ethical Movements*, p. 32) is not strictly correct.
- 44 *A Christian View of Socialism*, p. 11.
- 45 "Shall We Abolish Institutions," *The Congregationalist*, LXXIX (January-June, 1894), 791.
- 46 "Human Limitations of the Church," *The Social Preparation for the Kingdom of God*, January, 1918, pp. 12-15.
- 47 Seudder, *On Journey* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1937), pp. 191 f.
- 48 Hughan, *Facts of Socialism*, pp. 145, 148. Cf. Edmond Kelley, *Twentieth Century Socialism: What It Is Not, What It Is, How It May Come*, (New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1913), p. xiv.
- 49 Quoted from *The New York Herald*, June 1, 1908, by Laubenstein, "A History of Christian Socialism," p. 31.
- 50 *The Christian Socialist*, December 15, 1913, p. 1.
- 51 Laidler, *Social-Economic Movements*, pp. 588 f., n.
- 52 *The Social Preparation for the Kingdom of God*, October, 1918, p. 13.
- 53 *Social Christianity*, pp. 81-120.
- 54 Cf. Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912), p. 397. Rauschenbusch was called "A Prophet of the Great Identification" in *The Social Preparation for the Kingdom of God*, October, 1918, pp. 12-15, but this is incorrect, for it was his inability to make the "identification" that kept him from Socialist Party membership.
- 55 Cf. John Spargo, *Americanism and Social Democracy* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1918).
- 56 *The Christian Socialist*, September, 1918 p. 1.
- 57 *Real Democracy*, December, 1919, p. 1.
- 58 E.g., cf. the contrasting opinions of Rev. A. L. Byron-Curtiss ("The Church and Reconstruction After the War," *The Social Preparation for the Kingdom of God*, October, 1918, pp. 9-11) and Vida Seudder ("Prophecy Coming True," *ibid.*, January, 1919, p. 12), the one representing a positive and the other a more negative attitude toward the Russian Revolution.
- 59 Shailer Mathews & G. B. Smith (eds.), *A Dictionary of Religion and Ethics* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921), p. 90.
- 60 Vida D. Seudder, *The Church and the Hour* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1917), p. x.

THE NEGRO AND METHODIST UNION

PAUL A. CARTER

INTRODUCTION: THE EMERGENCE OF THE ISSUES OF UNION

The schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1844, and her reunion in 1939, fall into a pattern remarkably similar to that of the great schism and reunion of the United States. The antislavery movement possessed religious overtones of the same evangelical temper characteristic of Methodism; and the centralized—constitutional, if you will—structure of Methodism exposed it to federal-versus-regional stresses similar to those that divided the nation. There is the significant difference that the Northern and Southern Methodists parted amicably, and did not become involved in partisan bitterness until after the adjournment of their last General Conference together, but otherwise the parallel is complete: general acceptance of the principle of emancipation by the founders both of church and nation; with the renaissance of slavery, the recession of this view, marked by a series of compromises in General Conference as in the Congress; the rise, and unpopularity, of militant abolitionism; a dramatic revival of partisan concern, marked by an acute constitutional debate¹; growing sectional irreconcilability; schism; conflict—and an eventual resolution of the breach *in terms of the tacit recognition by the North of the principle of segregation*.

All the phases of this historical parallel, as far as the clerical side of it is concerned, have been adequately explored except for the last-mentioned. The slavery breach in Methodism was well covered in Norwood's *The Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church*,² the intricate history of the negotiations, commissions, and conferences which led to the union of the Northern and Southern wings of the former M. E. Church with the Methodist Protestant Church in 1939 has been traced by John M. Moore in *The Long Road to Methodist Union*.³ But Bishop Moore's major emphasis is upon the constitutional process of separation and union rather than upon the dynamics of slavery and segregation on which the issue of separation and union really turned. Moreover, as a partisan participant in the union of the churches he naturally stressed the elements making for harmony over those making for disagreement; and as a bishop of the former M. E. Church, South, his inclination was to regard Negro segregation as a settled question. It is my intention in this paper to indicate that the question of segregation in the church, as in the nation, does not down quite so easily.

The debate over ratification of the Plan of Union in the (Northern) Methodist Episcopal Church turned on the status of the Negro in the new united Church. Bishop Moore summarizes and dismisses this debate in one paragraph:

The antagonism to the Negro Jurisdictional Conference forcibly expressed by certain white leaders and violently stressed by certain Negro leaders, and the reasons which they gave for their antagonism, recruited for a time the opposition in the South, especially in those sections where the membership of Negroes in the Church at all, and particularly in the General Conference, was strongly opposed. The Negro was made the chief obstacle to union by both groups, but for opposite reasons.⁴

Bishop Moore's chief interest in the Negro members of the M. E. Church⁵ was evidently their function as a *casus belli* for the Southern opposition—that is to say, as a problem which had to be solved prior to the union of the Northern and Southern white Methodists. But when one considers Negro Methodists as a community within Methodism with religious and secular aspirations of their own worthy of being taken seriously, one is confronted with historical questions which Moore does not answer: What features of this "Negro Jurisdictional Conference" were there to produce "violent" opposition? How large a following was represented by "certain" Negro leaders? Why did the reasons for this opposition produce, in turn, a negative reaction at the South? It is my hope that the evidence submitted herein will throw light on some of these points.

The crisis in Methodism in 1844 was precipitated by a conflict in the itinerant episcopacy; so, indirectly, was the crisis in the 1930's. The immediate cause of the schism had been the suspension by the General Conference of a slaveholding bishop; and Collins Denny, Sr., the leader of the modern Southern opposition to union, stated his objections in 1911 as follows:

It is stated that Bishops . . . should circulate throughout the Church . . . If one of the Conferences should elect a Negro Bishop to preside over the whole Church, there would be no Methodism in the South for him to preside over. We cannot possibly subject our people to that possibility.⁶

The prevention of that possibility could have been achieved in either of two ways: by removing all Negroes, and hence all potential Negro bishops, from the rolls of the united Methodist Church; or by constitutionally restricting the activity of bishops, so that no Negro bishop could "circulate throughout the Church." The first view was held by many, if not most, Southern Methodist advocates of church union down to about 1920 when the North elected its first non-missionary Negro bishops: it was the official position, for example, of the Oklahoma City General Conference of the Church, South, in 1914. In view of the

vigorous Negro church life which had developed in the Methodist Episcopal Church after the Civil War, this was never a practicable basis for church union; "It is clear to those who know the loyalty and devotion of the masses of the negro ministry and membership of our church that [if they are to leave it] they must be *forced out*," said Bishop Thirkield in 1916.⁷ The idea, however, never quite died; Bishop Moore, for example, continued to advocate the separation of the Negro Methodists even after union had been consummated with the Negroes included,⁸ and it doubtless lingers in Southern circles of the united Methodist Church.

The other method of meeting Southern objections consisted in the creation of Jurisdictional Conferences, midway in authority between the General and the Annual Conference. The boundaries of all but one of these Conferences would be geographic; the other would be based upon race. The Jurisdictional Conferences, including the Negro Jurisdiction, would elect the bishops, who had theretofore been chosen by the entire Church. This would involve a breakdown of the traditional Methodist itinerant episcopacy, required by the *Discipline* to travel "throughout the Connection;" but since the work of the bishops since before the turn of the century had already been administratively divided into Episcopal Areas, the practical difference in itinerancy would be slight. Indeed, inasmuch as a great deal of the Negro work of the Northern church was grouped into two such Episcopal Areas already, presided over after 1920 by Negro bishops, the reader may wonder wherein the proposed jurisdictional plan differed sufficiently from the existing situation in the Northern church to warrant opposition to the one and support of the other. This will be discussed at greater length below; for the moment let me observe only that in the Northern Church prior to unification the presiding bishops of these Episcopal Areas were still elected by the General Conference of the church as a whole. This meant that Negro and white delegates were obliged to consult together in the election of both Negro and white bishops. It was to be argued in behalf of the Jurisdictional Plan that the Negro members would be better off under it because they would be assured of bishops of their own choosing; but the growing integrationist party among American Negroes regarded the loss in inter-racial relationship as offsetting the gain in Negro autonomy under the new arrangement.

After two false starts at unification, in 1920 and 1924, the last of many Joint Commissions of the M. E. Church, the M. E. Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church, on December 12th, 1935, released the text of the Plan of Union which was to become the basis of the actual merger of 1939. Acceptance of the jurisdictional idea was explicit; there were to be five geographical jurisdictions (Northeastern, Southeastern, North Central, South Central, and Western), and one

based upon color, the Central. I am fully aware that the Plan represented the unanimous opinion of the Commissioners, including two Negroes. I submit, however, that the size of an opposition is often less important than its nature; and that the opinion of the Negro Commissioners, admittedly able men, was demonstrated by the ultimate outcome of the debate to be unrepresentative of their people.

The clearest contemporary discussion of the merits and defects of the Plan of Union from the Negro standpoint appeared in *The Crisis*, the official journal of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, in an article by two Negro ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church entitled "Methodist Union and the Negro." This is sufficiently comprehensive to deserve summarizing here:

PRO: the Jurisdictional Conference was "largely administrative;" it did not differ in principle from the organization of certain non-English-speaking Methodists in America for convenience into German, Swedish, or Norwegian-Danish Annual Conferences—or from "the existence of separate Negro [local] churches, separate Negro Annual Conferences, and separate Negro Episcopal Areas." The General Conference, the supreme governing body of the Church, remained unsegregated. It was true that the General Conference would no longer elect the bishops, white and Negro, who would preside over it, but this would work to the advantage of the Negroes by enabling them in their separate jurisdiction to elect their own leaders, rather than having their votes "swallowed up" in a mixed jurisdiction. Since it was constitutionally provided that all Jurisdictions, including the Central (Negro) and the Southeastern, should have equal representation on the administrative boards of the Church, the Plan "would increase points of contact with the white Methodists of the South."⁹

CON: This last statement was challenged: the Plan was "a deliberate move to reduce the contact with the Negro to a minimum." The analogy between the existing segregation-pattern in the M. E. Church and the proposed Negro Jurisdiction was historically inaccurate: the creation of Negro congregations and Annual Conferences had been "on the basis of a 'mutual understanding,' " to enable the Negro "to make the most of the situation" which society at large had imposed upon race relations. "The new plan differs from the present arrangement in that it would write into the very constitution of the church the article of segregation."¹⁰ As an example of the increased restriction on racial mobility in the church under the Plan, if it should be desired to transfer a Negro congregation out of a Negro Annual Conference into the appropriate white Annual Conference covering that geographic area, the consent of both *Jurisdictional* Conferences involved would have to be obtained. This meant, in other words, that the Plan of Union made it for practical purposes constitutionally impossible for Negroes to crack

the color line in those parts of the Methodist Church located in the South even if a local situation developed which favored it.

This issue of segregation, however, was by no means the entire story. Behind the floor debates at the Northern and Southern General Conferences lay the driving force of the Ecumenical Movement. Others have discussed this remarkable reversal of the fissiparous tendency historically characteristic of Protestantism in a thorough fashion beyond the scope of this paper; I shall here only indicate the somewhat uncritical nature of this trend by pointing out that most discussion of the state of Christianity by Christians takes it for granted that the divided character of American Protestantism is an evil—one hears little reference to the social and religious vigor of sectarianism. There will be something to be said on this point in our concluding remarks.

American Methodist ecumenicalism in particular was augmented by considerations arising out of the Social Gospel; in the various crises of our age its leaders called for religious unity in order to make a concerted attack on evil. A particularly effective summation of this ecumenical basis for unification sentiment in both North and South is contained in the Episcopal Address to the Southern General Conference of 1938:

The problems of our world are too great and grave to be met by any one branch of the Christian faith. We must minimize our differences, magnify the cardinal tenets that unite, and consolidate our common spiritual resources if we are to stem the tide of secularism that is sweeping across the world. No compromise of essential values is involved in joining with evangelical Christians in every nation and presenting a solid front against the common enemies that oppose the Church everywhere.¹¹

METHODISM'S GREAT DEBATE: THE NORTHERN GENERAL CONFERENCE

The final General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church met at Columbus, Ohio, on May 1st, 1936, to transact its quadrennial affairs and to pass upon the Plan of Union. The Episcopal Address, the traditional message from all the bishops to the constituency, included a thoughtful discussion of the conflict between the social and individual gospel then raging in the Church, pronouncements on various social issues (including a forthright paragraph on the Negro), and an emphatic endorsement of the Plan of Union in terms explicitly ecumenical. Changes on this ecumenical theme continued to be rung throughout the Conference. The President of the Federal Council declared that "The evils in this world are too great for any sort of a divided Church."¹² Bishop Ainsworth, fraternal delegate from the M. E. Church, South, linked ecumenicalism with the Church's social message: "The solidarity of mankind is being hammered into us . . . Mankind must be one or we will soon be none, and Christianity must rebuild

the world on the basis of brotherhood . . . United Methodism must lead the way."¹³ The fraternal delegate from the British Methodist Church saw the world potentiality of American Methodism in the context of the moral force of America in collective security.¹⁴ "There isn't a bridge in America built by the forces of evil that can withstand the tramp, tramp, of eight million Methodists," was the cry of President Broomfield of the Methodist Protestant Church.¹⁵ And Bishop Edwin Holt Hughes, summing up the work of the Conference in his address just before adjournment, called the merger

the blessed example that may providentially result in other needed mergers in Protestantism. . . . Your overwhelming vote . . . has been succeeded by an increasing assurance that in this great matter we have done the will of God.¹⁶

It should be borne in mind that the Plan of Union was presented to the Churches to be accepted or rejected *as a whole*; many delegates, therefore, immersed in this ecumenical atmosphere, who had reservations against the arrangement with respect to the Negro members, nevertheless voted for the Plan as a greater good. Important objections, however, were raised on the ground that no end was sufficiently high to warrant the violation of minority rights for its attainment. *The Christian Century* editorialized: "From the Christian standpoint, the determining element should not be what a minority under great pressure is willing to take, but what the majority, in the light of its responsibility to the minority, must feel under obligation to offer."¹⁷

This was entirely in keeping with the conclusion to which Methodists had come in 1916, that "the Negroes themselves [should] confer about, agree to, and confirm whatever decision is made"¹⁸—and by this criterion, if the reaction of the secular Negro press is any indication of contemporary Negro opinion, the merger of 1939 was clearly a mistake. The headline on the front page of the *Pittsburgh Courier*, then the most widely-circulated Negro newspaper, in its issue published next after the Northern Methodist vote on Unification, was characteristic: RACE PROTEST IGNORED AS OHIO METHODISTS VOTE FOR MERGER.¹⁹ *The Crisis*, official organ of the N. A. A. C. P.—then considered a comparatively conservative organization—ran an editorial entitled "Jim Crow for Jesus."²⁰ The *Philadelphia Tribune* was even more caustic: "God watched and followed the proceedings with keen interest; when the conference insulted His intelligence by approving segregation of Negroes in His name, He took a walk."²¹ If General Conference voting strength is in any sense representative, then the pattern of opposition must be extended to the Negroes of the M. E. Church; in a caucus held the Saturday evening before debate began, 33 of 44 Negro delegates present asked David D. Jones as their spokesman to

" 'protest in a mild, but manly, way against this Plan of Unification.' "22

The opposition at the Northern church's General Conference, however, was not confined to Negroes. In spite of the ecumenical considerations which kept many white delegates on the side of church union, a small but determined group stood with the majority of the Negro delegation in voting against ratification of the Plan of Union. The most outstanding of these in my opinion was Lewis O. Hartman, chairman of the New England Annual Conference delegation and at that time editor of the small but influential independent Methodist weekly *Zion's Herald*—which, then as now, bore a relation to the rest of the Methodist press somewhat resembling that of *The Nation* to the rest of the American press. (It is a matter of historic fitness that we not only find New England once again a center of intransigence on the Negro question, as at an earlier point in Methodist and national history, but also find *Zion's Herald* playing a role comparable to its own militant abolitionist stand of a century before.) Hartman campaigned editorially against the union with the M. E. Church, South from the moment it became apparent that the jurisdictional agreement was to be the basis of that union; and while he accepted the verdict of the majority and was eventually elected to serve the united Methodist Church as a bishop, he remains convinced that the merger was a mistake.²³

It was most fitting, then, that Hartman should lead off the debate on the actual resolution. He made it plain at the outset that he was in favor of the general principle of church union:

We are faced not with a clear-cut choice between an absolute good and an absolute evil; rather, we are presented with two "goods," one the great desirability of Unification and the other the equally great desirability of keeping clear of the very appearance of the evil of race discrimination. . . . I cannot bring myself to endorse unification at the price of the Negro.²⁴

His most important contribution to the discussion was to remind the Conference that the world social mission of the Church, which had been cited by the advocates of union as an argument for the Plan, could also be used against it:

It has seemed to me that . . . the whole issue has been approached too much from the angle of organization and administration and too little from the less tangible, but equally important, viewpoint of . . . the effect of the possible passage of the Plan of Unification upon our prophecy and our witness before a listening world. . . . It is possible to unite and pile up a great total of millions of members and yet lose our spiritual power.²⁵

Hartman was followed in the debate by Harold P. Sloan, who defended the plan as an enlargement of Negro opportunity "not . . . discrimination against the Negro, but . . . discrimination in favor of the

Negro,"²⁶ protecting him against being outnumbered and hence unable to have an effective say in the Church. A rebuttal to this was made by Ernest F. Tittle: "To be sure, by segregating Negroes in a Negro Conference we give them political opportunities which they would not possess as minority groups within our white conferences; but we take away from them the experience of Christian brotherhood which, in my judgment, is far more important"—a tacit recognition that racial antagonism works both ways. Dr. Tittle also made the point that Methodists in this matter were lagging behind other churchmen and also behind secular organizations:

The Protestant Episcopal Church has not felt it necessary to do it [segregate the Negro] . . . Southeastern share-croppers, black and white, are forming a union . . . and they [the Negroes] are asking "Is it possible that an organization without any religious profession of faith can transcend a historic, irrational, un-Christian prejudice, whereas the Christian Church cannot do so?"²⁷

Negro speakers were heard on both sides of the question. David D. Jones, president of Bennett College in North Carolina, called the Plan "segregation in the ugliest way, because it is couched in such pious terms;" Matthew Davage, president of Clark University in Atlanta, countered that the plan had "not been thrust upon us"—that "two of the ablest men in our group," Bishop Robert E. Jones and President Willis J. King of Gammon Seminary, had been on the Joint Commission which formulated the Plan and had concurred in the jurisdictional arrangement. A more telling point was that Negro participation, even restricted to the General Conference and administrative board level, in a church which would include Southern whites, would make the Methodist Negroes "the only members of our race having real organic relationship with influential white leaders of the South."²⁸ But opponents of the union explained this minority Negro support for the Plan, and also that of white leaders whose social liberalism was unquestionable such as Bishop McConnell, as "the outcome of a process of rationalization and wishful thinking induced by an almost irresistible enthusiasm for unification."²⁹

After some two hours of debate a delegate moved the previous question, which had the effect of preventing the introduction of an amendment which would have put the Conference on record as in favor of the Plan of Union but with a reservation against the Negro Jurisdictional Conference. The fate of this amendment, had it been offered, is of course problematical; but in view of the heavy vote in favor of the Plan as it stood, and the fact that the amendment would have left the M. E. Church with a different Plan from that presented to the other two constituting Churches, thereby jeopardizing the merger, I believe that the amendment would have been voted down. The vote of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was: for the

Plan, 470; against, 83. Of the 47 Negro delegates present and voting, 11 cast their ballots for, 36 against.³⁰ "When the vote was announced," the correspondent of the *Christian Century* reported, "the conference arose and broke forth into singing, 'We're marching to Zion.' Many people of the colored race did not rise and did not sing . . ."³¹

"You may adopt this Plan. We are powerless to prevent it," David D. Jones, the spokesman for the majority of Negro delegates, had said in the debate. " . . . All we can do is to appeal to time."³² With unification a *fait accompli* as far as the Northern Church was concerned, many of its Negro members seem to have resigned themselves to the inevitable. Edgar A. Love's statement on May 12th typifies this view:

You have adopted by an overwhelming majority, in the face of a pronounced objection to this Plan by a great majority of the Negro delegates, this plan . . . We are going into this new setup graciously and with the avowed purpose of making Unification, as far as we are concerned, a success.³³

But expressions of opposition continued. Lorenzo H. King, pastor of St. Mark's Methodist Church in Harlem preached a sermon on Methodist unification which was printed and circulated:

Under this "Plan" . . . every other race group in America can join, and move with freedom in any section of the Methodist Church, except the Negro. . . . This "Plan" will emasculate the Christian gospel of its moral imperative.³⁴

The protests became more strident as it became increasingly apparent that the ratification of the Plan would inevitably be sustained. In fact, the vote of the ministerial and lay delegates to the Annual Conference was proportionately more decisive even than that of the General Conference—17,239, to 1,862, or about 9 to 1.³⁵

METHODISM'S GREAT DEBATE: THE SOUTHERN GENERAL CONFERENCE

With the Northern church committed to Unification, the desire to hasten the completion of ratification became evident in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. At their 1936 sessions, 25 of the 38 Annual Conferences comprising that Church petitioned their College of Bishops to submit the Plan of Union for their approval the following year—so that Annual Conference action would be complete *before* the South's General Conference met, thus hastening the process of union. This was accordingly done; the ministers and lay delegates to the Annual Conferences of 1937 accepted the Plan of Union by 7,650 votes to 1,247. The Plan was thereby placed before the General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, for final action.

The Episcopal Address to that final Southern General Conference, which convened in Birmingham, Alabama, on April 28, 1938, was appropriately devoted in large part to an historical review of the achieve-

ments of the Church South, since it was anticipated that that Church would shortly lose its separate identity. As with the Northern Episcopal Address of two years before, the document made pronouncements on sundry social questions, including a remarkable statement on the Negro which bears favorable comparison with the Northern declaration, and argued for the Plan of Union in ecumenical language which we have already quoted.³⁶ Echoes of ecumenicity continued to be heard in the subsequent floor debate. "Our native people think that all Christians are brethren," asserted a missionary to the Congo. "Now, what would they think of us . . . if they could be . . . told that we must continue separate? . . . I will be ashamed to go back to the Congo next year if we are going to go back again as Southern Methodists."³⁷ "The condition of the world is too serious for three great churches to be tied hand and foot," said George H. Lamar.³⁸ Harry Denman, evangelist, predicted "a great spiritual awakening in America" as a result of union.³⁹

But in the Southern church, too, voices were raised in opposition. Two were those of bishops, Collins Denny⁴⁰ and Warren A. Candler, who took a step unprecedented in Methodist history by declining to sign the Episcopal Address. A statement by them in opposition to the Plan of Union was published alongside the Address in the *General Conference Journal*. But the debate itself was on the whole a model of courtesy and good humor, partly because the result was recognizably a foregone conclusion and the opposition pinned its hopes on a legal issue. It was agreed on motion of T. D. Ellis, the floor leader for the proponents of unification, that the previous question would not be moved until all who wished to speak in opposition had had their say;⁴¹ thereby a debate which had taken up some two hours at the Northern General Conference took all day in the more leisurely atmosphere of the South.

The Southern opposition focused upon what the Northern and Western majority in the united Church might force upon the South. The resolution of the North's General Conference of 1932 committing future Conferences to accept invitations only from cities where Negro delegates would receive equal treatment in hotels and restaurants was a particularly sore point; in recognition of the element of sacrifice in the South's decision for unification it should be pointed out that entry into the united Church meant forfeiting the possibility of a General Conference in any city in the South for the foreseeable future.⁴² Fear was expressed that the membership loss because of individual unwillingness to become associated with Negro churchmen in any way would destroy Methodism in the South--just as fear had been expressed that the membership loss because of unwillingness to accept segregation in any way would destroy Negro Methodism in the North. A delegate viewed with alarm "the Communistic organization of the Northern Church," by which in context he evidently meant its qualified racial integration.⁴³

One delegate challenged ecumenicalism in terms that surprisingly resembled Hartman's as expressed at the Northern General Conference: "I am fearful that this merger is too big, and history says that when a church becomes a grounded estate, it becomes more or less in harmony with the worries of that day and loses the power to lift men heavenward."⁴⁴

But the significance of the Southern debate lies not in the nature of the opposition, which ultimately turned out to be even more inconsiderable numerically than in the Northern Church, but in what was said on behalf of the majority. For in rebutting the arguments of the enemies of unification, its advocates asserted the very claim that the Northern opposition had advanced as arguments *against* unification, namely, that the Negro Jurisdictional plan safeguarded, if it did not actually advance, segregation. Clare Purcell of the North Alabama Conference, later Bishop, said:

If next Sunday morning . . . a Negro comes down and says "I would like to join your church," what can I tell him? Where will I have legal authority to say, "You cannot come into this church?" I would have absolutely no grounds upon which to stand, but if you adopt this Plan, I can tactfully suggest to him that he would be more at home in his own communion as provided in the Central Jurisdiction of this plan.⁴⁵

This, and statements like the following, would seem to clinch the case for the negative at the North:

The General Conference . . . is confined to legislate on those matters which are distinctly connexional and those only. They can change the number and boundaries only upon the consent of the majority of the annual conferences in each jurisdiction. Under that rule they can't possibly put anybody in that we don't want.⁴⁶

"We are in this Plan, brethren," said T. D. Ellis in his speech formally closing the debate, "preserving every essential ideal that we have in the South on the Negro question."⁴⁷ His fellow-delegates agreed with him by a roll call vote of 434 to 26.

This was not quite all; for a legal objection to the Plan of Union had been raised. The Judicial Council of the M. E. Church, South ruled the merger valid; but the dissidents, unwilling to accept defeat, attempted to prevent the property of several local churches from passing into the hands of the new Methodist Church which came into existence in 1939, and thereby transferred the controversy to the civil courts (the division of the Book Concern between North and South in 1851 by order of the United States Supreme Court comes to mind: it is an interesting historical observation on the pattern of church-state relations that both the schism and the reunion of American Methodism ultimately required the seal of Federal adjudication). The courts eventually ruled

that neither the property nor the name Methodist Episcopal Church, South could be claimed by the dissenting group.⁴⁸ Having lost its bid for control of part or all of the material and spiritual assets of the M. E. Church, South, the opposition nevertheless remained alive, in a new religious body known as the Southern Methodist Church—whose membership in 1947 of 6,327,⁴⁹ chiefly in South Carolina, was not enough to disturb the slumbers of the eight and a half million members of The Methodist Church.

CONCLUSION

The Uniting Conference of the three branches of Methodism met at Kansas City on April 26, 1939 to complete the unification. This Conference was largely procedural in nature; the question of union had been settled at the General and Annual Conferences of the constituting Churches. In an impressive ceremony, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church formally passed into history and what is now simply The Methodist Church was born. This is not to say that the question of church and race was thereby settled; on the contrary it continued to come up, notably at the General Conference of 1944—one hundred years after the Church divided over another phase of the same issue.

One of the least satisfactory aspects of the relationship between Methodism and the Negro, for example, was at the level of the local church—about which very little has been said in this paper because there is very little to say. Frank S. Loescher has shown that this malady is characteristic of American Protestantism:

A survey of almost 16,000 churches in six denominations has failed to discover a single 'white' church with an 'open' or mixed membership in areas undergoing transition [*i. e.*, areas where Negroes are moving in and whites moving out, as the periphery of Harlem]. It is only when colored members are in the majority that membership in transition areas is open.⁵⁰

Now this situation as far as Northern Methodism was concerned admittedly antedated unification. But it had been on an *ad hoc* basis; and the entrance of all but 7,000 of the 316,000 Negro members of the M. E. Church into the Central Jurisdiction did not merely perpetuate segregation—it rendered its modification, at the level of local-church mobility, almost impossible.

At the Annual Conference level, results of movements for integration were mixed. On the one hand, it was provided in 1948 that all new Negro work in the vicinity of New York City would be under the New York and New York East Conferences of the Northeastern Jurisdiction, instead of under the Delaware Conference of the Central (Negro) Jurisdiction as had previously been provided,⁵¹ but here the precedent of mixed Annual Conferences already existed. On the other hand, a simi-

lar move by the Detroit Conference, inviting Negro local churches in from the coterminous Lexington Conference of the Negro Jurisdiction, failed to win majority approval in the white North Central Jurisdiction which included Detroit—a striking example of the effectiveness of the new constitutional segregation even at the North.⁵² On the whole, the overwhelming majority of Negro members of The Methodist Church could echo the judgment of *The Crisis* that “separation by statute . . . remains in force virtually forever.”⁵³ The sacrifice in the principle and practice of racial toleration at the North was considerable, as charged by Negroes and confirmed by Southern whites in the debates. This is the prime fact which has been glossed over in accounts of Unification and which is hereby put on the record.

Much could nevertheless be done in the field of race relations within The Methodist Church as it now stands. Both the M. E. Church and the M. E. Church, South had, in their way, long traditions of ministry to the Negro. At the top level of church administration, the Southern members of the Council of Bishops have been uniformly courteous to the Negro bishops; racial equality prevails at General Conference and on the administrative boards. Some of the most articulate Negro members of the Methodist Church are not members of the Central Jurisdiction, and while their numbers are small, population shifts may change the social picture entirely, inasmuch as New England and the Far West are not included in the Central Jurisdiction at all. A most encouraging sign recently was the invitation by the Southern California Annual Conference to Bishop Alexander P. Shaw, a Negro, to preside over it. And the General Conference of 1948 adopted a statement looking to the eventual end of racial discrimination in the Church. While there is a great gulf fixed between a resolution and its embodiment in legislation, this is at least on the record as a standard for self-criticism, and for those who stood in opposition to unification on grounds of Christian brotherhood it represents a modest moral victory:

The principle of racial discrimination is in clear violation of the Christian belief in the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the Kingdom of God, the proclamation of which in word and life is our gospel. We therefore have no choice but to denote it as unchristian and to renounce it as evil. *This we do without equivocation.*

We therefore recommend:

That every Methodist, and every Methodist church, conference, and institution accept the achievement of full fellowship in our churches as a vital responsibility.

We are not unmindful of the difficulties to which we summon The Methodist Church in this matter. . . .⁵⁴

Against these forthright words, unfortunately, must be set a factor which was implicit in the arguments of the opposition: the obscuring of the Church's witness in the world by its augmented size. Even before

the merger friendly critics were calling it the "Methodist Statistical Church;" since the Uniting Conference, the Church's social message has tended to bog down in an impersonal—and essentially secular—administrative bureaucracy. This is nowhere better illustrated than in our present subject of race relations. The resolution on discrimination which has just been quoted was the outcome of a debate on the church and race at the General Conference of 1944 which was in the finest self-searching tradition of American Methodism. This debate also produced a Committee on Church and Race, whose fact-finding report to the General Conference of 1948 was referred to the standing Committee on the State of the Church. This report was accepted as information and referred in turn to the Inter-Agency Committee on Social Issues, a panel of members from the several administrative boards of the Church. This committee happens not to have a Negro member to keep interest in this matter alive—and has taken no action on this report of any kind, with the next General Conference now practically upon us. One wonders if this kind of run-around—all the more deplorable if unintentional—is to become characteristic.

The advocates of unification, of course, as we have seen, regard the increase in combined numbers as an increase in effectiveness, as a means to the better bearing of an ecumenical witness. But this in turn suggests that the Ecumenical Movement, at least in its American form, needs closer scrutiny. Even if the Central Jurisdiction should prove ultimately to be no barrier to the integration of the Negro into the Methodist Church—even if it should prove, in the long run, to be the best means to such integration—the fact that an important minority considered that it was wronged, and was so emphatically overridden by the majority, would still be relevant in a critique of Unification. The obsessive chant "eight million Methodists" which has accompanied and followed Unification—eight and a half million now, as any Methodist can tell you—betrays an acceptance of the tenet "My heart is pure because my strength is as the strength of ten" which is hardly characteristic of Christianity at its best.

A fact of surpassing historical interest has, in my opinion, emerged from this discussion: an implicit splitting of the Social Gospel movement. The old Social Gospel in America, as defined by H. F. May to exclude conservative "Christian stewardship" on the one hand and radical "Christian socialism" on the other, was coherently one program, to be accepted or rejected as such.⁵⁵ Now the Ecumenical Movement in its American phase has been closely related to the Social Gospel—indeed, Hopkins titles his account of the rise of the Federal Council "The Churches Federate for Social Action."⁵⁶ Yet here we find this socially-oriented ecumenical drift in American Methodism at odds with another social issue confronting the Church—not merely the race ques-

tion but the general problem of the rights of minorities. Has this Church become so secularized as to have fallen into the ideology of "compulsory consensus" which is a present danger in American society? The issue is obviously more complex than the "rise" or "decline" of the Social Gospel; there is a qualitative change involved. The new theology's criticism of the social order—so much more drastic, in essence, than that of the casually optimistic liberals of the Progressive-Social Gospel era—might well be transferred to a criticism of social ecumenicalism, which can become a source of spiritual pride quite as insidious as any other kind. An instance of this, it seems to me, is the argument by speakers at the Methodist General Conferences of 1936 and 1938 that church union would facilitate a "revival" of secular America; they should have devoted their attention to a revival of Methodism. For not only is the segregation of Negroes not in keeping with the spirit and work of John Wesley and Francis Asbury, but, more generally, some such radical re-examination must precede any re-kindling of the historic crusading spirit of Methodism which has been conspicuously obscured in recent years.

1 In the nation, a debate over the relative powers of the Federal Government and the States; in the church, over the relative powers of the General Conference and the Episcopacy.

2 John N. Norwood, *The Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1844: a Study of Slavery and Ecclesiastical Politics* (Alfred, N. Y.: Alfred University Press, 1923).

3 John M. Moore, *The Long Road to Methodist Union* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1943).

4 Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 198f.

5 There had been no Negroes in the Church South since 1870; they seem to have requested separation themselves because the Black Codes of the period (1866) had made their position in the Southern Conference impossible to maintain.

6 Quoted in Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

7 Quoted in *A Working Conference on the Union of American Methodism* (New York and Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1916), p. 252.

8 In justice to Bishop Moore it should be added that he combined this program with the more constructive suggestion that the detached Negro Methodists be in their turn merged with other independent Negro Methodist bodies, partly in the interests of the elimination of Negro Methodist denominational rivalry. He pointed out how the Negro Baptist had flourished following the union of their major groups into the National Baptist Convention. This overlooks, unfortunately, the great difference in temper between the Negroes of the mix-

ed church and the African Methodists or the Colored Methodists. Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

9 R. M. Williams, in "Methodist Union and the Negro," *The Crisis: a Record of the Darker Races*, 43, 5 (May, 1936), 158.

10 Charles Carrington, in *ibid.*, p. 149.

11 *Daily Christian Advocate: General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, XXIII* (Birmingham, 1938), p. 12.

12 *Journal of the Thirty-Second Delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, (New York and Cincinnati: the Methodist Book Concern, n. d.) p. 628.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 602.

14 *Ibid.*, pp. 658ff.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 614.

16 *Ibid.*, pp. 354f.

17 *The Christian Century, an Undenominational Journal of Religion*, LIII (Jan. 1, 1936), 7.

18 *A Working Conference on the Union of American Methodism*, p. 128.

19 *Pittsburgh Courier*, XXVIII, Saturday, May 9th, 1936, p. 1. Other sample headlines: WHITES CONSIDER M. E. MERGER GOOD THING FOR THE NEGRO (Apr. 25th); HISTORY SHOWS MERGER WILL SPEED SEGREGATION IN SUBTLE MANNER (May 9th).

20 *The Crisis*, June, 1936, p. 177.

21 Quoted in press roundup in *ibid.*, July, 1936, p. 211.

22 *The Daily Christian Advocate: a Record of the General Conference of the*

- M. E. Church, XXIII (Columbus, O., 1936), p. 87.
- 23 As of January 3rd, 1951, when interviewed by the author, *Zion's Herald*, although no longer under his editorship, continues to hold the same position on unification—see, for example, the scathing editorial "Southern Comfort," *Zion's Herald*, January 31, 1951, p. 103. The *Alabama Christian Advocate* replied in kind on February 27; the controversy of letters, at any rate, remains alive.
 - 24 *Daily Christian Advocate* (M. E. Church), pp. 85f.
 - 25 *Ibid.*, loc. cit.
 - 26 *Ibid.*, p. 86.
 - 27 *Ibid.*, p. 87.
 - 28 *Ibid.*, p. 88.
 - 29 *Zion's Herald*, CXIV, 10 (March 4th, 1936), 221.
 - 30 General Conference vote from the *Journal*, p. 204. Negro vote from the *Pittsburgh Courier*, May 16th, second section, p. 10.
 - 31 *Christian Century*, LIII, 21 (May 20, 1936), 741.
 - 32 *Daily Christian Advocate*, (M. E. Church), p. 88.
 - 32 *Ibid.*, p. 311.
 - 34 Rev. Lorenzo H. King, "Methodist Unification," pamphlet, the National League Against Racial Segregation in the Church of Christ, no date.
 - 35 The Methodist Protestant Church ratified the Plan of Union by a General Conference vote of 142 to 39 and an Annual Conference vote of 1,265 to 389. The issue here was not race but fundamentalism; the dissidents reorganized as the Bible Protestant Church.
 - 36 See above, p. 59.
 - 37 *Daily Christian Advocate* (M. E. Church, South), p. 29.
 - 38 *Ibid.*, p. 34.
 - 39 *Ibid.*, p. 39.
 - 40 Whom we have already encountered in a rôle of protest against union with the North—see above, p. 56.
 - 41 *Daily Christian Advocate* (M. E. Church, South), p. 24.
 - 42 There has been some discussion since the unified Church came into being of the possibility of holding a General Conference in a Southern city if special arrangements could be made with the local authorities (Hartman in interview).
 - 43 *Daily Christian Advocate* (M. E. Church, South), p. 36.
 - 44 *Ibid.*, p. 30. Cf. Hartman: "It is possible to unite and pile up a great total of millions of members and yet lose our spiritual power."
 - 45 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
 - 46 *Ibid.*, p. 42. Cf. the discussion in *Crisis* above, p. 58.
 - 47 *Ibid.*, p. 62.
 - 48 An excellent and thorough treatment of the legal aspects of unification may be found in Walter McElreath, *Methodist Union in the Courts* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1946).
 - 49 *Yearbook of American Churches*, 1949 (Lebanon, Pa.: published by the Sowers Printing Company), p. 67.
 - 50 Frank S. Loescher, *The Protestant Churches and the Negro* (New York: Association Press, 1948), p. 79.
 - 51 *Doctrines and Discipline of The Methodist Church*, 1948 (Nashville and elsewhere: The Methodist Publishing House), Paragraph 1726, p. 417.
 - 52 Loescher, *op. cit.*, p. 53; Hartman, interview.
 - 53 *The Crisis*, June, 1936, p. 177.
 - 54 *Doctrines and Discipline of The Methodist Church*, 1948, Par. 2026, p. 600.
 - 55 Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America*, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), esp. Part IV.
 - 56 C. H. Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940), chap. xvii.

SURVEYS OF RECENT LITERATURE

I. CONTINENTAL EUROPE SINCE 1648.

In what follows a certain arbitrary selection of recent works will be made. Most of them are substantial and deserve extended and critical review.

After a full generation the interpretation of the history of modern Protestant theology has been taken up again by two brilliant exponents of the antithetic poles of German theology. Karl Barth published in 1947 his *Protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (Zürich: Evangelische Verlag Ag. Zollikon, 611 pp.). Half of it was devoted to the 18th century, where Rousseau in particular was singled out as the type of the modern view against which Barth prophesies. (Godet translated 150 pages worth of this as *Images du XVIII^e siècle* [Neuchâtel, Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1949]). Beginning with Schleiermacher, Barth then treated almost a score of nineteenth century figures, ending with Ritschl, the list being confined to German philosophers and theologians. The promise of Barth's title is thus only partially fulfilled.

From the radically opposite viewpoint, meanwhile, Emmanuel Hirsch was composing a monumental *Geschichte der Neueren Evangelischen Theologie in Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1949-). The first two volumes have now appeared, dealing with the period from 1650 to 1750, and several "Lieferungen" of Volume 3 (1750-1833). Some five volumes, or about 2500 pages, are thus to be devoted to the thought of precisely that epoch of liberal tendency so generally deplored in Germany today, but which Hirsch considers of permanent significance.

The first volume dealt with the three great themes of the secularization of the modern state (Grotius, Hobbes, Spinoza, Locke, Bayle, Pufendorf, Thomasius), the new cosmology and its implications for religious faith (Copernicus, Kepler, Galilei, Descartes, Newton, Spinoza, Bekker), and the rise of "natural religion" to replace positive revelation in Holland and England in the 17th and 18th centuries. This cleared the way for a second volume concentrated on German developments (Leibnitz and Wolff; Spener, Francke and Bengel; Boehme and the radicals Arnold, Tersteegen, Dippel; Pfaff, Mosheim, Turretin, Zinzendorf, Wettstein, down to Schmidt, the first rationalist).

Two regional studies of high quality might be mentioned, both of which have significance and interest beyond the areas treated. Heinrich Hermelink, formerly of Marburg, published in 1949 a *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Württemberg von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart. Das Reich Gottes in Württemberg* (Stuttgart und Tübingen: Wunderlich, 528 pp.). Henri Strohl, formerly dean of the Protestant faculty at Strassburg, wrote on *Le Protestantisme en Alsace* (Strasbourg: Editions Oberlin, 1950, 508 pp.).

A wide perspective on the history of German Protestantism over the last hundred years is opened by the former biographer of Wichern, Martin Gerhardt, in *Ein Jahrhundert Innere Mission, Die Geschichte des Zentral-Ausschusses für die Innere Mission der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirche*. I. Teil, Die Wichernzeit, II. Teil, Hüter und Mehrer des Erbes. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1948. 856pp.).

Materials for the history of the

great struggle of German Protestantism with Nazism are appearing in substantial quantity. J. Beckmann edited a volume of the *Kirchliche Jahrbuch für die Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland* containing documents for the period from 1933 to 1944. (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann 1948, 533 pp). The former Marburg professor of church history, Heinrich Hermelink, edited a companion volume, *Kirche im Kampf. Dokumente des Widerstands und des Aufbaus in der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von 1933-1945*. (Tübingen: Rainer Wunderlich Verlag, 1950, 710pp). Hermelink supplies historical annotations for his sources, which he has arranged in six periods. In so far as an emphasis is apparent, he presents the viewpoint of the southern "intact" churches and their spokesman Bishop Wurm, in contrast to the "confessing church" orientation, as for example in W. Niemoeller, *Kampf und Zeugnis der Bekennenden Kirche* (Bielefeld: L. Bechauf Verlag, 1948, 527 pp). Theodore Bachmann will soon present in this quarterly an article on this whole subject.

The story of reorganization after the Nazi collapse, from Treysa to Eisenach and the constitution of the E. K. D., is to be read in Beckmann's succeeding volume of the *Jahrbuch*, for the years 1945-1948 (Bertelsmann, 1950, 483 pp). With the 1949 volume (1950, 630 pp) the usual form of an annual is resumed, and the organization of the E. K. D., its "Rat," its first synod, the Kirchentag and the adoption of the Hilfswerk, ecumenical relations, personnel of educational and ecclesiastical institutions and even statistics are to be found. The contributor of an article on the sects in Germany, K. Hutten, has written more extensively on this subject in *Seher, Grübler, Enthusiasten. Das Buch der Sekten*. (Stuttgart: Quell-Verlag der Evangelischen Gesellschaft, 1950, 303pp).

Among Roman Catholic scholars the great Fliche and Martin history should be mentioned first. Five of its proposed twenty-four volumes are

planned for the period since 1648. Of these only one, Volume XX, has yet appeared, the work of Professor J. Leiflon, *La Crise révolutionnaire, 1789-1846* (Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1949, 524 pp). For much the same years we now have also A. Latreille, *L'Eglise catholique et la Revolution, I. Le Pontificat de Pie VI et la crise française, 1775-1779* (1946 280pp), and II. *L'Ere Napoléonienne et la crise européenne, 1800-1815* (1950, 292pp) both at Hachette, Paris, and Charles Ledré, *L'Eglise de France sous la Révolution* (Paris: Laffont, 1949, 321 pp.), the last of which emphasizes internal life and thought, and especially the period of the Directory. A parallel account is to be found in H. Haag, *Les Origines du catholicisme libéral en Belgique (1789-1839)* (Bibliothèque de l'Université, Bureaux du Recueil, Louvain and E. Nauwelaerts, 2, Place Cardinal Mercier, Louvain, 1950, 300 pp.).

Professor Hocedez of the Jesuit College of Louvain has undertaken to complete and replace Bellamy and Grabmann with his *Histoire de la théologie au XIX^e Siècle*. The third volume, *Le Règne de Léon XIII, 1878-1903* appeared first (L'Edition Universelle, S. A., Rue Royale 53 Bruxelles. Desclée de Brouwer, Rue des Saints Peres, 76 bis et 78, Paris, 1947, 418 pp). Next came the first volume, *Décadence et réveil de la théologie, 1800-1831* (1949, 269 pp), which found its foci in Hermes, Lamennais and Moehler. The reigns of Gregory XVI and Pius IX remain to be treated.

Among biographies and memoirs which illuminate this recent life of the Roman Church may be noted, Ludwig Freiherr von Pastor, 1854-1928 *Tagebücher-Briefe-Erinnerungen*, ed. by W. Wühr (Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle Verlag, 1950, 949 pp); M. de la Bedoyere, *Life of Baron von Hügel* (London: Dent and Sons, 1951, 366 pp) (using unedited materials. A new selection of letters is also planned by the author.); Abbé F. Klein, *La Route du Petit Morvandiau*,

of which volume IV, *Une hérésie jaïnisme, l'Americanisme* (Paris, Plon, 1949, 433pp) has perhaps the greatest historical value.

Jacques de Bivort de la Saudée wrote a history of 19th and 20th century reunion efforts in 1949, *Anglicans et Catholiques, V. I Le problème de l'union anglo-romaine* (1838-1933). A companion volume of sources has since appeared, V. 2, *Documents sur le Problème de l'Union Anglo-Romaine* (1921-1927) (Paris. Librairie Plon, 1949, 283 pp). Charles de Clerq, meanwhile, has undertaken to continue Hefele's *History of Church Councils, Histoire des Conciles d'après les*

documents originaux. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané). Volume IX, and Volume X, part 1, dealt with Trent. Volume XI, part 1, treats *Conciles des Orientaux catholiques de 1575 à 1849* (1949, 492 pp), showing various decisions on the acceptance of Tridentine canons and the attempts at codification of canon law. Jedin's *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient*, although concerned with the period prior to that surveyed here, will provide an indispensable background for the study of modern Roman Catholicism. The first volume was reviewed in our last issue.

J. H. NICHOLS

II. CHURCH-HISTORICAL SOCIETIES AND THEIR JOURNALS

It may be of value to the readers of this journal to get some information about church-historical magazines published by the societies of church history in other lands. Most of these organizations are older than our own, but their purposes resemble ours very closely and the problems they face are like our own. Their membership is generally not large; their annual meetings are commonly attended by only a few loyal members. But they all are actively engaged in the furtherance of research in church history; and by the publication of their journals they make substantial contributions to this end.

In *England*, there does not seem to exist a society of church history, but, since 1950, a group of the most distinguished English church historians has begun to publish *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. It is edited by C. W. Dugmore, the Bishop Fraser Senior Lecturer in Ecclesiastical History in the University of Manchester. It is published twice yearly (in April and October) by Faber and Faber, 24 Russell Square, London, W. C. I. (Price: \$3.50). The first two volumes, each comprising 248 pages, contain very substantial critical and informative articles on general church history (naturally, special attention is being

paid to phases of English church life) and critical reviews on selected books. Each issue also presents a bibliographical article written by an expert in a special church-historical area.

The *Scottish Church History Society* was founded in 1926 and has published the papers read at its various regular meetings in the *Records* (Glasgow, The Scottish Church History Society). At present, the members of the Editorial Board are Professor Hugh Watt, Professor J. H. S. Burleigh; and the Rev. Thomas Maxwell. In 1950, the society was made up of 82 members and had 29 library subscriptions. Its papers are collected in 10 stately volumes filled with detailed studies of Scottish church history, some of which, like Professor A. F. Scott Pearson's recent article on *Alesius and the English Reformation*, (vol. 10, 1949, 57-87), deserve to come to wider notice.

The *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, in many respects the most illustrious of the special journals of our discipline, had to suspend publication during the Second World War. The 62 volumes so far published since 1880 are a mine of information. The articles they contain reflect the great progress which has been made in church history during the last three generations. The *Kirchengeschichtliche*

Gesellschaft, which used to sponsor this journal, has apparently collapsed during the Nazi turmoil. But efforts are now being made to revive both this organization and its journal. Professors Hans von Campenhausen, K. A. Fink and Ernest Wolf constitute the new editorial board. They have succeeded in publishing only Heft 1 of vol. 63 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1950), but, to judge from a notice printed in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, vol. 76 (Oct. 1951), the publisher apparently hesitates to print further issues (some of which have already been assembled) because of lack of general support. In view of the fact that other German theological journals which were abolished during the war, have now been resuscitated, it is to be hoped that the ZKG also will soon resume its distinguished record of publication.

The *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* has had a better fortune. It too suspended publication in 1944. But it has been revived by the re-constituted *Verein für Reformationsgeschichte* and by the recently organized *American Society for Reformation Research*. Continuing the tradition begun in 1938 by Professor Gerhard Ritter who, on assuming the editorship of the journal, devoted it to research in "the history of the Reformation and its significance in world affairs," the new German and American board of editors (Professors Gerhard Ritter, Heinrich Bornkamm, Roland H. Bainton and Harold J. Grimm) plans to publish articles not only on the Reformation in its several phases but also on the history of Protestantism. The first double-issue of 1951, vol. 42, (Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1951, 288 pages) is extraordinarily rich in content and augurs well for the future. Next to articles on Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Butzer, and Justus Jonas, it presents studies on phases of Dutch, Swedish and English Protestantism. (The latter is the first part of a very suggestive study by Martin Schmidt on *Biblizismus und natürliche Theologie in der Gewissenslehre des englischen Puritanismus*). The review section, which contains also

a list of articles published in journals, is greatly enriched by a very important paper (by Professor Robert Stupperich) summarizing and evaluating the present state and the prospects of Butzer-research. [Subscriptions for this journal (\$5. a year; for members of the Amer. Soc. for Reformation Research \$4. a year) should be sent to Professor George W. Forell, Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota.]

In France, there are two general church-historical societies. The *Société de l'histoire ecclésiastique de la France* publishes the *Revue de l'Histoire de l'Eglise de France*, (Paris: Société Ecclésiastique de France, 52 Ave. de Breteuil; 1200- fr. a year). It is edited by Jean-Remy Palangue, Raymond Limouzin-Lamothe and Jean de La Mouneraye. Each volume (the last one was vol. 37, 1951) comprises ca. 300 pages. The journal specializes in French Roman Catholic church history and publishes articles as well as source documents. A special feature is a regular bibliographical review of the contents of French regional historical journals.

La Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français, which was founded in 1852, issues a quarterly (now in its 99th year of publication) entitled *Bulletin Historique et Littéraire* (Paris: Au siège de la Société, 54 Rue des Saints-Pères; 600.- fr. a year). Its present editor is Professor Philippe de Félice, the successor of the distinguished church historian, Jacques Pannier. Each annual volume contains 120-160 pages. The journal is the best source and guide for the study of the history of French Protestantism, particularly because of its publication of Huguenot documents.

The Catholic University of Louvain in Belgium has published since 1900, the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*. This journal is not the organ of a church historical society, but it must be listed among the several national and international journals of church history. For it is the most comprehensive one among them all. The most recent complete volume, that of 1950

(vol. 45) comprises 996 pages plus 444 pages of bibliography! The articles published in this journal are devoted primarily to Roman Catholic church history, but its reviews range over the whole field of church history, and its extensive news-section (*Chronique*) contains reports, listed by countries, on all aspects of ongoing church-historical research. Of special value is the annual bibliography on church history (now prepared by S. Haussens). It is unrivalled in its completeness and comprehensiveness. Even the major reviews of important books are listed. The journal is now edited by A. de Meyer; R. Draguet; J. Lebon; Ch. Terlingen; E. Van Cavenbergh; L. von der Essen; and H. Wagnon. Its publication is made possible by grants from the Belgian government and from the *Fondation Universitaire de Belgique*. (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, Bibliothèque de l'Université. 450.- fr. b. (= \$9.-) a year).

Small Switzerland produces two church historical journals. The *Arbeitsgemeinschaft katholischer Historiker der Schweiz* publishes the *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg/Schweiz: Paulus Verlag; 9 fr. a year). This quarterly (now in its 46th year of publication), pays exclusive attention, in articles as well as in reviews, to Swiss Roman Catholicism. Each volume comprises 320 pages. Professors Oskar Vasella; Louis Waeber; and Othmar Perler are the members of the present Editorial Board.

The *Zwingli Verein* sponsors *Zwingliana* (Zürich, Buchdruckerei Berchtold; 5.- fr. a year), a journal devoted to research in the history of Zwingli's Reformation and of Swiss Protestantism. Annually two *Hefte* are published and the issues of several

years constitute one volume (vol. 9 is now in process of publication). The published volumes contain much valuable information on all phases of the Swiss Reformation [See the article by Professor L. von Muralt, the present editor, (in vol. VIII (1947), 369-372) on *50 Jahre Zwingliana*.]

The *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* (S'Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff; f. 15.75 a year) is now in its 39th year of publication. It is edited by Professors J. Lindeboom; M. Van Rhijn; and J. M. Bakhuizen van den Brink. Each volume comprises about 256 pages. The articles deal almost exclusively with Dutch church history; the review section is very small.

The Church History Society of Sweden (*Kyrkohistoriska Föreningen*) celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation in 1949. Its journal, the *Kyrkohistorisk Årsskrift* (Stockholm; Almqvist och Wiksell, 11 kr. a year) now edited by Professor Gunnar Westin, is intended to be a general church historical magazine, but, naturally, most of the articles published in it deal with Swedish church history (See the review of the 50th anniversary vol. by Edgar Carlson in this journal (June, 1951, p. 82).

There are many other journals devoted to church historical research in its local, regional, and denominational aspects. They should not be neglected by the student of church history. We may review them in a later issue. The purpose of the present report is to call attention to the work of general church historical societies in other lands—in the hope that, in the not too distant future, some concrete cooperation among them may be established.

WILHELM PAUCK

BOOK REVIEWS

Primitive Gospel Sources. By B. P. W. STATHER HUNT. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951. pp. xv+344. \$6.00.

In the last fifty years, especially among English scholars, there has been considerable enthusiasm for the idea of early first-century books of "testimonials," collections of Old Testament passages assembled in order to prove various points of Christian doctrine and to show that the gospel was the fulfillment of prophecy. The theory dates from as early as the eighteenth century, but was given especial force by E. Hatch in his *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford, 1889), 203-14. The first known example of such a testimony book is the lost work by Melito of Sardis, but the *Exegeses of the Dominical Oracles* by Papias may have contained similar materials. From the third century we have Cyprian's *Testimonia*, as well as some dialogues of doubtful date.

Hunt's book is an attempt, like that of Rendel Harris, to show that a testimony book or books underlies or underlie the synoptic gospels, whose materials are collected in relation to the fulfillment of prophecy. As he says, his theory is nothing new; he had virtually completed his book thirty years ago, and others have held that "the primitive Testimony Book . . . dominated the outlook of all the writers of the N. T. from the very first" (p. 304). It is a variant of the current insistence upon the unity of the Old and New Testaments, usually expressed by authors who believe that they can think "typologically," and that their imaginations provide the best insight into New Testament exegesis. Hunt's interpretations, however, are more sober than most, and much more sober than E. C. Selwyn's *The Oracles in the New Testament* (London, 1911), not to mention more recent works.

The principal difficulty with his book

is that he will take a piece of evidence, build an hypothesis on it, then build more hypotheses on the hypothesis, and so on. The result is a steadily diminishing degree of probability. Hunt makes much of the composite citation in Mark 1, 2; but we must commend Lohmeyer's caution (*Das Evangelium des Markus*, Göttingen, 1937, 11 n. 2) in saying that "vielleicht" it comes from a testimony book. Writers on testimony books are accustomed to argue that when Paul and some later writer agree in the order of the citations they give or in providing composite citations, both are relying on an earlier lost document. O. Michel (*Paulus und seine Bibel*, Gütersloh, 1929, 37-54) has effectively disposed of this argument by pointing out that the latter writers used the Pauline epistles. It is hard to believe with Hunt (p. 132) that 1 Peter 3, 19-20 is based on a quotation from the apocryphal Jeremiah transmitted through a testimony book; cf. W. Bieder, *Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi* (Zürich, 1949), 135-53. Relying on Harris, Hunt (pp. 199-200) argues that since the quotations in Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 4, 33 (not 30), 11, and Justin, *Apol.* 1, 48, 2, introduce similar (not identical) quotations from Isaiah with the words "at his coming," therefore both rely on a testimony book. But (1) Irenaeus certainly knew Justin (cf. F. Loofs, *Theophilus von Antiochien Adversus Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenaeus*, Leipzig, 1930, 339-74—slightly exaggerated), and (2) the preceding verse in Isaiah (35, 4) speaks of God's coming. The invention of a testimony book, here at least, is not necessary.

These points must suffice in a brief review. We need not deny that there were testimony books in the early church, for Melito certainly wrote one. That they existed in the first cen-

tury is questionable, and that they were used by the evangelists remains highly doubtful, with the possible exception of use by Matthew. The gospels are not simply testimonies writ large, just as the gospel is not simply a reproduction of the Old Testament.

ROBERT M. GRANT

The University of the South

Gospel and Law: The Relation of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity. By C. H. DODD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951. 83 pages. \$1.50.

The author begins with the recognized theme that Christian ethics rest on a religious basis and proposes to examine this truism. In the New Testament epistles, and also in the Gospels and the oral traditions, we find a distinction of kerygma and didache; a distinction that can also be recognized in the Mosaic legislation. The paraenesis of the church rests back in the epistles on religious affirmations related to history, and in the gospels upon historical narrative theologically interpreted. Attention is then drawn to the patterns of moral teaching of early Christianity as they have been studied by Philip Carrington and E. G. Selwyn, with their analogies in the practise of the synagogue.

Dodd then turns his attention to those special motives of Christian ethics which modified Hellenistic paraenesis: Christian eschatology, the idea of the Body of Christ, the imitation of Christ, and the primacy of love. In his view the effect of eschatology on ethics is seen first in the way temporal concerns are subordinated, and later in the way life is conceived in terms of new depths of experience and responsibility. The chapter on the ethical teaching in the gospels argues that the New Testament church recurred constantly to the sayings of Jesus himself. For example, the fourteenth chapter of Romans invokes by allusion authoritative words also found in the gospels. The characteristic features of Jesus' imperatives are their "liveliness," the fact that they are not immediately applicable to

specific behavior (here contrast the epistles), and that they spring out of a sense of the ripeness of God's work, calling for decision.

The final chapter, "The Law of Christ," challenges the common understanding of the theme that Christ is the end of the law, and shows how in Paul himself we have insistence on law in a real sense. Just as Hans Windisch argues that Jesus does not merely call for right "disposition" or "intention" but for obedient action, so Dodd argues that Paul and the New Testament generally do not teach "freedom" in the way it is often formulated. Here there is a discussion of Paul's contrast of "letter" and "spirit." The author urges effectively that Paul here repudiates the old covenant as "letter" in the sense of code, but understands the new covenant in terms not of Christian antinomianism or "inner light" or of Augustine's "love and do as you please." Ethics for Paul represent commandments calling for actions having a "quality" and "direction" determined by the love of God as made known in the gospel. Here Dodd concludes, in line with his essay on natural law in the New Testament, that just as Jesus appeals characteristically to the creation as sanction for ethics and Paul to the law written on the heart, so the Christian today may rightly challenge not only the saints but the world with the ethics of the new covenant.

The book deals with questions that are prominent today in ecumenical discussion, in which the author has been involved. His position differs from that of many continental participants who for example distinguish sharply the ethic of redemption from that of creation and confine the relevance of the former to the church. Dodd's defense of the aspect of law in the New Testament is not to be reproached as a Christian legalism. His position is analogous to that of the Gospel of Matthew. The didache is so closely related to the kerygma that it cannot take on the character of an autonomous code. At the same time we are thus forewarned against any

arbitrary spiritualizing of ethics of a kind that would evade the full claim and power of the gospel.

AMOS N. WILDER

The University of Chicago

The Book of Thirty Centuries.

By STANLEY RYPINS. New York: Macmillan Company, 1951. 420 pages. \$7.00.

This volume is a rather amazing production to come from a professor of English. The author undoubtedly has technical competence in the areas under consideration and has devoted much study to his subject. The result is therefore a good introduction to certain aspects of the history of the Bible, especially the problems and methods of textual criticism and the translation of the Bible into English. It falls short of being a satisfactory introduction to the whole subject because of certain obvious gaps and disproportionate emphasis in the treatment.

After surveying the external matters regarding the text, including description of the chief manuscripts (chaps. 1 and 2), Professor Rypins discusses the "revision" (i.e., restoration) of the Old Testament text (chaps. 3 and 4) and the New Testament text (chap. 5). A strong statement on the importance and difficulty of text criticism is supported by examples from Shakespeare and the Bible. At this point the average reader is apt to bog down in the technical detail of a rather unnecessarily extensive exemplification of the cause and correction of variant readings in the text. Here as elsewhere in the book significant recent work in some areas is apparently unknown, while in other areas the data are quite contemporary (e.g., the Dead Sea Scrolls). Some observations regarding "Aramaic gospels" make no mention at all of New Testament scholarship and take no account of the fact that arguments here must be based on historical as well as philological considerations.

The patristic evidence is treated incidentally in connection with the discussion of textual variants, but a separate chapter (6) is devoted to

some early versions, i.e., the Septuagint and other Greek translations of the Old Testament, the Coptic, the Latin, and the Syriac. The other versions, except for a brief and unsatisfactory allusion to the American, are not noticed. There is virtually nothing on published texts, and a statement describing Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint as superseding the Cambridge edition reflects a common confusion. The Göttingen Septuagint, of which Rahlfs' two-volume edition was only a preliminary publication, is a critical text; the Cambridge text, like the older Swete, is primarily an edition of Codex Vaticanus with a large critical apparatus. The two, therefore, will supplement but not supplant each other. Several volumes of the definitive Göttingen text—not mentioned by Rypins—have been published.

A review of the data on the early printed Bible and on translations into modern English occupies chapters 7 and 8 respectively. The former includes English, German and French editions and is especially valuable for information on Hebrew and Latin incunabula. The account of Greek New Testament texts stops with Beza, and there is, unfortunately, no comparable treatment of later and modern editions. Nor is any comprehensive or historical statement of the theory and method of textual criticism attempted which would relate the discipline to the construction of modern critical texts. Such references as are made to the later printed texts of the New Testament are unsatisfactory. Only three such texts are listed in the Bibliography (von Soden, Souter, Westcott-Hort), though allusion to Tischendorf is made elsewhere. A note on page 203 offers the strange intelligence that the Hort text has been superseded by von Soden's.

Actually, the text most widely used today, if not Westcott-Hort, is probably Nestle's. This is nowhere mentioned so far as I remember—unless it is alluded to among the copious and detailed footnotes. The "new Tischendorf" texts edited by Legg, among others, and the current work of the

International Committee on the New Testament text are unrecognized.

The account of the modern English Bible provides an interesting survey of the various problems involved in the art of translation, largely illustrated by Old Testament examples and chiefly given to considerations of literary style.

A final chapter contains a sample of the application of "historical criticism" to certain areas of biblical study, namely, the Pentateuch, the Synoptic Gospels, and the history of the Canon. While good so far as they go, these discussions really stop with literary criticism and are conspicuously out of date. Important developments of the last two or three decades are passed over in silence, e.g., "form-criticism" in the Gospels. The material therefore should not be taken to represent contemporary historical criticism.

Some appended Tables give brief but useful lists of the principal uncial Greek manuscripts and papyri of the Old and New Testaments together with their contents. Reference here to more adequate listings might have been made, e.g., to the complete accounts of New Testament papyri published by Maldfield and Metzger in 1949 in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* and in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. (Rypin's list contains 9 of the 62 known items.) The "Select Bibliography," like the book, is disproportionate in emphasis. No less than nine introductions to the Old Testament are given (five of them in German and several very old); yet Pfeiffer's work is unnoticed here or elsewhere, and no New Testament introduction is cited at all.

Elaborately detailed as the volume is, its chief value may be as an introductory and supplementary resource in the areas indicated.

ALLEN WIKGREN

The University of Chicago

The Parish Chest: a study of the records of parochial administration in England. By W. E. TATE.

Cambridge: University Press, 1951. pp. x, 346. \$4.75.

The parishes of old England have been aptly called the cradles of our liberties and democracy. For there, from medieval times, townsmen and village freemen were trained in the conduct of communal affairs both ecclesiastical and civil. The parish chest—forerunner of the steel safe of today—became the repository of a wealth of archival material of diverse content, priceless to the local antiquary, and no less to the social and economic historian. Tudor legislation first specifically directed the keeping of Parish Registers to record baptisms, marriages, and burials; to which a diligent parish clerk or a conscientious churchwarden frequently added "other things pertaining to the church or parish." There were also the wardens' accounts, charity records, inventories of tithe and glebe lands, notices of unusual occurrences in parish life. All this on the ecclesiastical side. But the parson, wardens, and vestry had also civic responsibilities: for the keeping of the peace, care of the poor, apprenticeship, illegitimate children dependent on public care, the upkeep of roads and bridges, supervision of common lands within the bounds of the parish. Thus it is that the contents of these oaken chests take us back through changing social and economic conditions, to recreate something of the life of the English village as it was on the eve of the Reformation period.

Mr. Tate has produced a comprehensive and carefully organized dissertation, primarily to guide researchers into this wealth: the parish and its officers, the chest and its varied contents, what to look for, and where. Much in the book is unusual and quaintly fascinating. Frequently, intriguing examples of these old records are quoted *verbatim*. The American reader may never have occasion to explore the treasures of an English parish chest; but he will learn here something of that little world of village politics out of which the New England town meeting was born, of that old England that ended not much

more than a century ago.

PERCY V. NORWOOD

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary.

The Brethren of the Common Life.
By ALBERT HYMA. Grand Rapids,
Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing Co.
1950. Pp. 222. \$3.50.

In 1924 Professor Hyma published, under the title *The Christian Renaissance*, the substance of his doctoral thesis (1922) at the University of Michigan. This work was concerned with the religious movements in the Lowlands initiated by Gerard Groote. Though not a best seller, it was taken over by a large publishing house and in the course of time it went out of print. Some scholarly interest has in the meantime been shown in the *Devotio moderna*. Hyma has now decided to publish what he calls (p. 7) "a second history" of this movement. For this "second history" the reader may be grateful, both to Professor Hyma and to the publisher.

In his Preface Hyma puts forward several points to justify this "second history." He remarks that little interest was evinced in this movement at the time of the publication of his first study in 1924 by historians of Europe and America, that it was then difficult to locate the original sources, but that "during the past fifteen years a large number of scholars have turned their attention to the *Devotio Moderna*, with the result that thousands of manuscripts have been carefully examined and their contents made known." On this assumption the reader must be expected to look, in this new book, for notable advances in the results, and for significantly greater precision in detail than was possible when the author published his thesis in 1924.

The resultant comparison of the two books hardly bears out these expectations. The title "Christian Renaissance" has wisely been dropped. There were many Christian renaissances. The Introduction is unchanged. To Chapter I a short introductory paragraph is prefixed. The rest of

the text is identical with the 1924 work. Chapter II is unchanged. A short paragraph is prefixed to Chapter III, the rest of the chapter remaining unchanged. The same is true of Chapter IV. Chapter V has undergone some revision, mostly by abbreviation and elimination of paragraphs now apparently regarded as dispensable, and Hyma speaks (p. 166ff.) with a little more assurance than before of Zerbolt's authorship of the "original version of the *Imitation*." But even section 5 of this chapter in which this argument is made is composed of substantial sections taken from chapters VI-VIII of the 1924 work. Yet this chapter presents a slightly new line of argument, due to researches dating from the mid-twenties in the so-called Eutin copy of Book I of the *Imitation*. It is the evidence unearthed in this MS that leads Hyma to regard Thomas à Kempis as merely an amateurish plagiarist-reviser of Zerbolt. "In short, the facile pen of Gerard Zerbolt gave to the *Imitation* such power that his assistant now known as Thomas à Kempis could not reduce it to the level of mediocrity." (p. 194). It is this original work of Zerbolt that Hyma has himself recently translated.

We are grateful for the revision and the presentation of these new conclusions, but the demanding reader would have liked to have the earlier parts reviewed. The mere suppression of many of the footnotes in the original edition is hardly enough. Surely, if so much research has been done on the whole movement, as Hyma clearly intimates in his Preface, some modification of thirty year old conclusions might have been necessary. But this thought leads one to examine the Select Bibliography. Out of a total of 187 titles listed, there are only 17 of a more recent date than Hyma's 1924 publication, and, of these 17, seven are by Hyma and two are doctoral theses directed by him. In three decades eight titles hardly constitute a formidable mass of research. Or, seen from another point of view, the point made by Hyma that little at-

tention had been paid this movement by European scholarship before ca. 1922 would seem hardly well taken, in view of the large proportion of the total research done before that time. Any scholar is *ex professo* enthusiastic about his subject but it is difficult to resist the impression that Hyma, in his desire to render justice to this important group, may have forgotten other powerful movements of evangelicalism that were *en train* elsewhere in Europe, which might in fact have had profound influence upon this movement and certainly upon individuals in it: the German mystics and the Friends of God, the evangelicalism in Prague in the 1370's when the effects of the preaching of Conrad of Waldhauser and Milič of Kroměříč were still fresh and the religious life in the capital of the Empire was in ferment. Groote was in Prague for a considerable part of this time. It would appear that these possibilities have not been given due attention. At the same time the deep piety, the high intelligence and the passion for learning of the founders of the Brethren command respect, and Hyma's sympathetic understanding conveys itself to the reader on every page of his work.

Several matters of detail would appear to call for comment. There is no sound reason to say (p. 13) that Paris received "many fruits of the Italian Renaissance by way of the Low Countries." The heretical nature of Groote's thinking on the sacraments (pp. 24-26) might have been pointed out. The number of students that were educated at Zwolle (p. 93f.) between 1374 and 1417 (not 1317) would seem to be somewhat exaggerated. The remarks about the size of Culm (Chemno) on p. 108 and its "few inhabitants" and no carpenter are astonishing. It was a substantial city, the capital of a *województwo*, and there were already respectable buildings going up or already functioning. Ortwin Gratius is defended (p. 121) perhaps too fervently. The statement (p. 158) that very often a copyist would write with exactly the same hand at the age of 60 as he had em-

ployed forty years earlier is not the opinion of those who work in later medieval paleography. The index is quite inadequate. A book so rich in content and context deserved an index that would make it usable for the scholar.

S. HARRISON THOMSON
University of Colorado.

La crise religieuse du XVI^e siècle.

By E. DE MOREAU, PIERRE JOURDA,
AND PIERRE JANELLE. (Volume
XVI of the *Histoire de l'Église*).
Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1950. 461
pages. No price given.

This book comprises three major studies written by different authors and entitled "Luther and Lutheranism," "Calvin and Calvinism," and Henry VIII and Anglicanism." The first part dealing with Martin Luther was written by the distinguished medievalist E. de Moreau of the royal academy of Belgium. A brief introductory section describes the religious situation in the Germanies around 1500. Then in four successive chapters Moreau skillfully delineates the spiritual evolution of Luther, the development of his theology, the spread of Lutheranism in the Holy Roman Empire, the internal discords within the new religion, and the spread of Lutheranism into other lands.

Pierre Jourda, noted French historian who has specialized in the sixteenth century, has prepared the section on John Calvin and his influence. Jourda's analysis of the personality of Calvin and his discussion of the penetration of this new religion in France during the reign of Francis I (1515-1547) seem to be particularly well done. This section is completed by a chapter by E. de Moreau describing the development of Calvinism in the Low Countries down to 1585.

The third part of this work, which deals with Anglicanism, was prepared by Professor Janelle of the University of Clermont-Ferrand. In three chapters he sketches the religious history of England from the time of Henry VIII to the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. There is a brief but adequate

account of the religious settlement of 1559. A fourth and concluding chapter describes the progress of the Reformation in Scotland and in Ireland.

All three divisions of this book are footnoted, and there is an extensive, although not complete, listing of sources for each section. The narrative is well organized and at times even lively. To the reviewer it seems somewhat strange that there is no treatment of the career or influence of Zwingli or of any of the Protestant reformers in Switzerland outside of John Calvin. Professor Janelle's study appears to depend heavily upon the work of Gustave Constant, and not enough attention is given to the economic and constitutional aspects of the rise and development of Anglicanism. Seemingly the author has not made much use of the scholarly studies of Neale, Pollard, and Tawney, and perhaps too much reliance has been placed on Gasquet in the treatment of the dissolution of the monasteries in the reign of Henry VIII. Despite these defects this book presents a clear and readable synthesis of the Reformation era and is an important contribution to the projected twenty-six volume series, *Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*.

BERNARD C. WEBER
University of Alabama.

The Travail of Religious Liberty: Nine Biographical Studies. By ROLAND H. BAINTON. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1951. 272 pages. \$4.00.

In these nine biographical sketches, based on his James Sprunt Lectures at Union Seminary, Virginia, Professor Bainton of the Yale Divinity School deals in a popular, but sound and scholarly, way with the rise of religious liberty in the modern world.

The first three biographies concentrate on persecution—Thomas of Torquemada, the Roman Catholic persecutor and flaming apostle of the Spanish Inquisition, under which churchly and national ideals were fused in Spain; John Calvin, Protestant persecutor, whose role as the

"villain" of the piece is accentuated by further allusions in the chapters on Servetus and Castellio; and Michael Servetus, victim of persecution, whose burning by Calvin is taken as the turning point in the modern struggle for religious liberty.

The second trio of biographies deals with Continentals who contributed to religious liberty—Sébastien Castellio, erstwhile lay colleague of Calvin at Geneva, who looms as "hero" of the story and as a lasting influence for religious liberty; David Joris, Dutch Anabaptist visionary, taken as the type of heretic turned "hypocrite," silenced by persecution; and Bernardino Ochino, former general of the Capuchins and popular preacher in Italy, taken as the example, after his conversion to Protestantism, of heretic turned exile.

The last three sketches are of two in England and one in America who advanced the cause of religious liberty—John Milton, Roger Williams, and John Locke.

The author finds three prerequisites for persecution: the persecutor must be convinced that his doctrine is certain, that it is important, and that persecution will be effective. Because the Roman Catholic may not doubt the certainty or importance of his doctrine, doubt concerning the effectiveness of persecution in a particular situation—that is, a question of expediency—is the only ground on which he may be tolerant. But the Protestant Reformation, according to the author, weakened all three grounds of persecution. Furthermore the legal basis of persecution (being for Catholics the canon law, but for Protestants the Bible and Roman law) is far more secure for Catholics than for Protestants. Roman law was soon to pass out of vogue, and the Bible could be used only by combining the Christian doctrines of the New Testament with the legal penalties of the Old Testament. But the author finds some Protestants, like Calvin, strengthening the Catholic theory of persecution, and, on the other hand, he finds important tendencies toward tolerance within Catholicism, as fos-

tered chiefly by humanism, mysticism, and sectarianism. The influence of the Renaissance, on both Catholicism and Protestantism, is of course found to be strongly in the direction of toleration.

Rationalism, ethics, and mysticism are the forces stressed most in the birth of modern religious liberty. Rationalism pointed to a distinction between essential and nonessential truth; to a contrast between faith and knowledge; to the many-sidedness of truth; and to the value even of error in serving as a foil for truth. Ethics, the author finds, often turned emphasis from creeds to deeds; from inflicting suffering to enduring suffering; from the moral rights of a correct conscience to the moral rights of every sincere conscience; from intellectual precision to charitable toleration. Mysticism, on its part, defined faith in terms of inner experience and transformation rather than of intellectual assent; tested religion by the "Spirit" rather than by Bible or creed; and regarded the real "heretic" as one lacking the new birth, whose error lay beyond remedy of the magistrate's sword.

Throughout, of course, the author points to varying concepts of the church as related to religious constraint or freedom. He pronounces the effort of Calvinism to combine the Catholic concept of a church coterminous with society with the Anabaptist concept of the church consisting solely of convinced believers a failure, and expresses the opinion that the concept of the church as a voluntary society is today gaining ground in the West.

A closing chapter ominously warns that precedents of the past are not applicable to the contemporary threat to religious liberty from totalitarianism, because the environment, the objectives, and the methods of the new persecution are entirely different.

The first six biographies are based on previous studies, some of them by Professor Bainton himself, while the last three are quite new and fully documented from the primary sources. Frequent quotations from the biogra-

phies are used to good effect to provide contemporary flavor and authenticity. The chronological overlapping of most of the characters in either the sixteenth or seventeenth century makes possible an accumulative treatment and a three dimensional perspective often lacking in the biographical method. Ample backgrounds are delineated.

The author's outlook is consistently moderate and well balanced. While of course favoring separation of church and state, he is keenly aware of the perils of secularizing the state. While welcoming the contributions rationalism has made to religious freedom, he warns against the relativism which rationalism threatens. While viewing the church as a voluntary society (a concept which to the more churchly remains quite unsatisfactory) he warns against the tendency of extreme views to dissolve the visible church. Written by a recognized master of scholarly popularization, the book conveys to the lay reader quite "painlessly" and pleasantly a large amount of information and insight, and offers to the scholar stimulation and suggestiveness.

LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER
Princeton Theological Seminary.

*The Religious Foundations of
Leveller Democracy.* By D. B.
ROBERTSON. New York: King's
Crown, 1951. 175 pages. \$2.75.

The Levellers, "the first democratic party in the modern world," have been described by most modern interpreters as being exponents of an essentially secular philosophy. A. S. P. Woodhouse in *Puritanism and Liberty*, for example, acknowledges that the Leveller Party "at times adopts the language of religious enthusiasm," but he invokes a principle of segregation—which he confesses can scarcely be documented—in order to render this acknowledgement of an apparent religious orientation largely irrelevant. Bernstein and Petegorsky quite frankly label the religious terminology of the Levellers mere "front" and "camouflage." The present volume should ex-

plode this myth once and for all. To be sure, the Levellers did reject the idea of any dependence upon an authoritarian church in the Christian's battle against evil—indeed, an authoritarian church was regarded as part and parcel of the evil against which they fought—but the whole thrust of the Leveller movement was to maintain "the witness of faith against the world." If a denial of ecclesiastical authority is secular, then the Levellers were secular, but so to regard them would be to distort the meaning so of the word as to render it devoid of any significant content. It is equally true that the Levellers sought to make their faith socially and politically relevant, but their interest in liberty, justice, and equality was not rationalistic and "did not constitute in their minds . . . a shift to 'secular interests.'" It "is to rob their thought of meaning," asserts Robertson, to impute to the Levellers "a basic affinity with 'the heavenly city of the eighteenth century philosophers' or the naturalism of the nineteenth century."

The Levellers were first of all religious sectarians, and their political ideals were grounded upon and motivated by profoundly religious presuppositions. This becomes exceedingly clear in Robertson's analysis of their thought. The influence of religious ideas upon Leveller democracy was not limited, as some have maintained, simply to the covenant principle in the church which was transformed by analogy into the compact theory of the state, nor was the contribution to the left-wing religious groups to the development of democracy restricted to the experience in democratic procedure and organization gained within the church life of the sectarians. The fundamental theological understandings of the left-wing Puritans, Robertson insists, were involved at every point in the elaboration of Leveller political thought.

In the Leveller writings, resistance to tyranny is regarded as a religious duty designed to uphold the sovereignty of God by effectively curbing the usurpation of rulers. "No power on

earth," wrote Lilburne, "is absolute but God alone," and all earthly authority, therefore, must be exercised in accord with the principles of justice and right which God has imposed upon man. "God has set limits to every earthly power, and he sins against God and his own nature who does not resist tyrannical and 'unbounded' power." Government itself is made necessary by the corrupted will of man, for "man is naturally ambitious and apt to encroach and usurp upon the liberty of others. 'We know very well,' declared the Leveller leaders, 'the pravity and corruption of man's heart is such that there could be no living without (government).'" Voicing approval of the "large petition," Lilburne asserted that "whoever means to settle good laws must proceed in them with a sinister opinion of all mankind, and suppose that whosoever is not wicked, it is for want only of opportunity." What is true of men in general is also true of rulers. Consequently, arbitrary authority cannot be permitted, for this would lead only to rebellion against God; and, therefore, authority must always be surrounded with checks to keep it in due subordination. Aside from constitutional checks, the chief reliance in safeguarding the divine sovereignty was placed upon the common consent of the whole community, for any particular individual or individuals, unless curbed by a general consent, would be "something partial" to their own interest and would tend to subvert both right and justice.

The moral law by which all authority must be circumscribed, while partly obscured by the Fall, was once again declared by revelation and witnessed to by the Spirit, and it may be apprehended by the common man quite as well as by the learned and the mighty. The poorest "he" is quite as competent to understand and to interpret the fundamental law by which all men are bound as the highest ecclesiastic. In fact, "common men are more open to God's truth because they are not so likely to be 'wise in their own conceits.'" A Leveller Agitator at Putney could say that "those who

fear to trust the poor to vote distrust Providence itself. For 'the poor and meaner of this kingdom . . . have been the means of the preservation of this kingdom.'"

Finally, all government must respect the liberty of each individual to fulfil his obligations to God, as God shall make them known to him, and each individual must in turn respect the similar liberty of others. This is a sphere which must forever be kept inviolate, and the abrogation of this liberty is the most intolerable of all tyranny. The only person who could not be tolerated was the person who sought to deny this crucial freedom. As Robertson points out, Lilburne's struggle against political tyranny began in a conflict with the bishops, and the conflict with the bishops was the result of his own religious experience which had led him to reject the Established Church. "The soul set free through Christ, the soul knowing a liberating joy in the presence of the Holy Spirit, that soul could not tolerate man-made curbs and tyrannies. It must soar in its own strength and light."

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School.

Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health. By ROGER WILLIAMS, edited with a historical introduction by Winthrop Hudson. Philadelphia, The Westminster Press, 1951, pp. 103, \$2.00.

Dr. Hudson has done high service in making available this little book of devotion for all seekers after a firmer and more heartening religious faith and courage. It has lain hidden too long, overshadowed by the author's numerous writings on religious-political subjects.

Experiments, printed in London in 1652, was written by Williams as a letter to his wife, "upon her recovery from a dangerous illness." During her sickness he had been obliged most of the time to be absent from home among the Indians and had written

this "little posy fit and easy for thy meditation and refreshing" while still "in the thickest of the naked Indians of America, in their very wild houses, and by their barbarous fires."

The letter is divided into three main sections:

1. The Marks [or evidences] of Spiritual Life. (10 are listed).
2. The Marks of the health, strength and vigor, of this Spiritual Life.
 1. Our Communion with God. (12 evidences.)
 2. Matters Concerning ourselves. (11 evidences.)
 3. Our Righteousness toward others. (7 evidences.)
3. How we maintain this spiritual health? (7 helps.)

These Meditations reveal a Roger Williams not so clearly recognized in his keen and sharp debates with John Cotton over the true official relations of church and state and freedom of conscience, his argument with George Fox concerning liberty which may become license and his incisive letters to magistrates, officers of state and army, presbyters and scores of others on the most practical affairs of this world.

Dr. Hudson has made a distinct contribution in his *Historical Introduction* by his interpretation of Puritanism in general and portrayal of Williams within that religious order. In the main I agree with him but I find myself in disagreement, and almost violently so, when he makes the likeness too identical. For instance, "What distinguished Roger Williams from his fellow New Englanders was not a disagreement upon fundamental pre-suppositions but the singleness of devotion with which he pursued the implications common to them all."

Especially do I disagree when he states: "Actually, Roger Williams was the most otherworldly of all New Englanders—the whole end of his endeavor was for a blessedness not of this world."

What were these "implications of assumptions common to them all"? To the Puritans of Massachusetts and

Connecticut the will of God was the establishment of a Mosaic Theocracy in their respective colonies, necessitating the right and duty to persecute all who for conscience sake would not submit. And verily they pursued that implication!

As is well known Williams spent his entire mature life opposing that scheme and finally founding Providence and Rhode Island as a haven of rest for all troubled in conscience, the first Commonwealth in history declaring the separation of church and state. Strongly he ever argued against "the danger of bringing Moses his Pattern into Kingdoms now since Christ Jesus his coming," insisting that Moses' was the "Pattern in the typical Land of Canaan, the Kings of Israel and Judah" but not in America. And for that he was driven from his home in Massachusetts, as a man with a windmill in his head, as Cotton Mather, quoted by Dr. Hudson, later wrote, to live in the filthy, smoky wigwams of the Indians in constant danger of his life.

How in the light of this, and his voluntary mission, alone of the Puritans, to the Indians, it can be said that "the whole end of his endeavor was for a blessedness not of this world," is not clear. True he scorned this world's possessions—well indeed he might have been rich as proprietor

of Rhode Island—as smoke and thorns, perishable in a moment, but it was because, like Paul, he did not want to be encumbered by their weight as he set about his task of making a kindly society on earth, not because of a passionate and passive longing for heavenly bliss.

As he wrote his wife on her recovery, all these sufferings are disciplines to make us more Christlike in our services to others, "a spur to quicken us to abundant faithfulness in doing and suffering for the Lord and his Christ." (p. 102). "Work for the night is coming," was his motto. "How solicitous should we be . . . to get despatched what we have to do before we hear that final call." . . . "How frequent, how constant ought we to be, like Christ Jesus . . . in doing good . . ." (p. 103). In fact, it is a Mark of Spiritual Life "when we are cordially willing to go from hence that we may be with Christ, yet for the service of Christ and his saints we are cordially willing to stay in hard and difficult service." (p. 76).

One other word I must add, though it is not germane to this review. In the notice given this book under Religion in *Time*, Oct. 29, 1951, appears a portrait of Roger Williams which years ago was proved fraudulent.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Crozer Theological Seminary

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

December 27, 1951

The Council of the American Society of Church History met at 10:00 a.m. and again at 1:30 p.m. in the Blue Room of the Hotel McAlpin, New York City. Due to the delayed arrival of the president, Winthrop S. Hudson called the meeting to order and presided temporarily. Other members present were Guy S. Klett, James H. Nichols, Ray C. Petry, Carl E. Schneider, Matthew Spinka and Raymond W. Albright.

The minutes of the Council meetings of December 27 and 28, 1950 were approved as printed in *Church History* Vol. XX, No. 1, March, 1951.

The Council heard with sorrow of the death of Howard V. Yergin and voted to accept with regret the resignations of the following members: Arthur Adams, F. W. Buckler, Paul T. Buehring, Elmer T. Clark, Wayne K. Clymer, Kenneth L. Crose, Simon J. DeVries, Herman L. Gilbert, Albea Godbold, Rockland T. Homans, Frederick D. Kershner, Henry S. Leiper, Harold H. Lentz, Benjamin Lotz, Thomas Murray, John C. Roberts, Philip E. Rodgeron, William R. Siktberg, and W. Kenzies Whitelaw.

As required by the Constitution the Council voted to strike from the membership roll the names of the following persons in arrears for three years: J. W. Bailey, Robert W. Brockway, Edward V. Clarke, Peter Dalbert, William V. Dorn, Walter W. Eastwood, Joseph Haroutunian, William G. Harris, Floyd E. House, Charles F. Johnston, John D. Lee, Umphrey Lee, Charles W. Lowry, Thomas J. McMahon, F. H. Micklewright, Herschel G. Miller, George A. Neeld, Tiran Nersoyan, Jack R. Noffsinger, Clifford H. Plopper, Russel C. Prohl, Paul Rollet, Charles E. Schaeffer, Claude E. Spencer, Alexander Stacey, W. D. Stimple, Chancellor Williams, and Charles J. Woodbridge.

The Council voted to receive into membership in the society the following persons, who were properly presented, subject to the fulfillment of the constitutional requirement: Charles E. Allred, Samuel P. Anslam, Norman Baxter, Winslow E. Brown, Robert W. Burtner, James H. Campbell, David M. Carson, Paul A. Carter, William A. Clebsch, Thomas S. Colahan, Donald Davis, Enos Dowling, Douglas G. Eadie, Stanley E. Emerich, Mrs. Alta Erb, Bruce C. Galloway, Edwin S. Gaustad, Ross J. Griffith, W. P. Harmon, George W. Haskell, C. F. Henry, Robert E. Ledbetter, Norman H. Maring, Harold W. McSwain, Paul B. Means, Mrs. Hattie Menzies, Charles Mitchell, J. Edward Moseley, Arthur Nussbaum, Philip J. Ramstad, Edward J. Requardt, William Richardson, Wayne Rood, Alexander Schmemann, George C. Shoemaker, Karl F. Solberg, Claude Spencer, Ernest R. Tuffit, Reuben S. Turner, James S. Udy, Ben T. Welch, Judith B. Welles, Henry F. Werling, Charles P. Wiles, Arthur Winslow and Melton Wright.

The Council voted to request the membership committee to pursue the action voted a year ago relative to former members. (See 1950 minutes).

The editorial report was presented by J. H. Nichols and the Council voted to recommend to the Society favorable action on its recommendations. (See minutes of the Society). After a discussion of the regulations governing the Brewer Prize Award it was voted that the recommended rules be published in *Church History*.

The treasurer's report was presented and discussed and referred to the auditing committee consisting of Carl E. Schneider and Matthew Spinka.

The secretary reported that he had attended a planning conference for a meeting which would bring together the members of the theological

professional societies at the time and place of the meeting of the American Association of Theological Seminaries. The council voted to recommend to the society that the spring meeting be held at Louisville, Ky., during the week of June 9, 1952. The annual meeting shall be held in Washington, D. C. in December, 1952.

The report of the committee on the revision of the Constitution of the Society was read, discussed, revisions proposed and then adopted by the Council and recommended to the society for favorable action. (See minutes of the Society).

Attest: Raymond W. Albright,
Secretary

MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING, DEC. 27, 1951.

President Ray C. Petry called the seventy-first consecutive meeting of the society to order at 8:00 p.m. in the Green Room of the Hotel McAlpin, New York City.

The Minutes of the previous annual meeting were approved as printed in *Church History* Vol. XX, No. 1, March, 1951. The secretary reported the changes in membership and other actions of the Council.

The treasurer's report was read by Guy S. Klett. Carl Schneider reported for the auditing committee that the accounts were found correct and the books in proper order. The society adopted the treasurer's report as printed below.

J. H. Nichols presented the following report of the editorial board which was received by the society. The recommended actions were approved.

The report of the editorial committee concerns first the Brewer prize essays, and then with regard to *Church History*, its size, finances, format and policy, particularly as to reviews.

At the beginning of the year the new editors visited our printers to try to expedite the publication of the long delayed Brewer Prize Essay by Franklin H. Littell, *The Anabaptist Doctrine of the Church*. A commitment was secured for publication in the Spring of 1951. The printer was un-

able to fulfill the commitment, however, and paid the author forfeit. Proofs did not appear until fall and the work is now partly in page proofs. It should appear early in 1952. Mr. Ira Brown, winner of the following Brewer Prize contest, is engaged in negotiations for the publication of his study of Lyman Abbott.

The editors of *Church History* were commissioned to expand the quarterly to a 96 page issue, if this were possible within the budget of \$2500. A change in format was effected which saved costs and space and improved readability. So much space was saved, in fact, that even the printer was deceived and the March issue, planned for the new size, turned out at only 80 pages. The later issues reached the full size and the amount of material in the volume as a whole is nearly twice that in recent volumes. Since the financial year does not coincide with the publication year, the financial effect of the expansion of the quarterly is not yet apparent in the treasurer's report.

The development of book-reviewing in *Church History* has proved a slower process than had been hoped. The surveys of current research in various areas written by members of the Editorial Board were initiated in the September issue. It is hoped that they will be welcomed as one of the more useful features of the quarterly. An unexpected difficulty with reviews in general has been the abnormal reluctance of competent members of the Society to accept significant works for review.

The editors recommend that the appropriation for *Church History* for 1952 be again \$2500, and that they be authorized, if it proves advisable, to change printers.

The society voted to hold its spring meeting at Louisville, Ky., at the time and place of the meeting of the American Association of Theological Seminaries.

The committee on nominations presented its report through its chairman, Winthrop Hudson, and the so-

ciety duly elected the following persons to the respective offices and committees:

President, Sandford Fleming
 Vice-President, Sidney E. Mead
 Secretary, Raymond W. Albright
 Assistant Secretary, Mervin M. Deems
 Treasurer, Guy S. Klett
 Editors: J. H. Nichols and Wilhelm Pauck

Other Members of the Council:
 Matthew Spinka, Ernest G. Schwiebert, Winthrop S. Hudson, Massey H. Shepherd, Ray C. Petry, Carl E. Schneider, L. J. Trinterud and George H. Williams.

Editorial Board of *Church History*:
 J. H. Nichols and Wilhelm Pauck with the cooperation of Roland H. Bainton, R. Pierce Beaver, Robert Grant, Winthrop S. Hudson, Sidney E. Mead, Ray C. Petry, Matthew Spinka and L. J. Trinterud.

Membership Committee: John T. McNeill, Chairman, J. M. Batten, Quirinus Breen, George Forrell, Harold J. Grimm, Percy V. Norwood, and W. W. Sweet.

Investment of Endowment Funds:
 Robert H. Nichols, Chairman, Guy S. Klett and Frederick Loetscher.

Research Committee: L. J. Trinterud, Chairman, Roland H. Bainton, Harold S. Bender, Jerald Brauer, Robert Grant, John T. McNeill, Shelton Smith, Matthew Spinka, W. W. Sweet and George H. Williams.

Committee on Nominations: John T. McNeill, Chairman, John Brush and J. M. Batten.

Committee on Program and Local

Arrangements for the Annual Meeting: Ray C. Petry, Chairman, Nelson R. Burr, Nelson W. Rightmeyer and Raymond W. Albright, *ex officio*.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Spring Meeting: Carl Schneider, Chairman, A. K. Rule, H. E. Short and Raymond W. Albright, *ex officio*.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Pacific Coast Meeting: John von Rohr, Chairman, John L. Anderson, Quirinus Breen, Robert D. Clark, Sandford Fleming, Charles W. Hovland and Ralph Hyslop.

The committee on the revision of the Constitution presented the Constitution and By-Laws as compiled from the society's records by the committee and revised and adopted by the Council. The society adopted each article of the Constitution and By-Laws individually and then adopted the whole by a unanimous vote. By provision of Article VIII the Constitution and By-Laws as printed below are now effective.

During the days of the meetings the following papers were read: "Some Newly Discovered Whitefield Letters" by John W. Christie; "Luther and the Brethren of the Common Life" by W. C. Schnackenburg; "Celio Calcagnini (1479-1541)" by Quirinus Breen; "Christianity and Socialism in America, 1900-1920" by Robert T. Handy; "Social Responsibility and the Medieval Mystics" by Ray C. Petry; "Report on *Didache* Studies" by Cyril C. Richardson.

Attest: Raymond W. Albright,
 Secretary

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I—NAME

This corporation shall be known as the AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY.

ARTICLE II—OBJECTS

The object of this Society shall be those stated in the Act of its incorporation.

ARTICLE III—MEMBERS

Candidates for membership shall be proposed by any members of the society and elected by the Council; such candidates shall become members of the society upon payment of dues for one year.

ARTICLE IV—MANAGEMENT

Section 1. The management of the corporation shall be in a Council of fifteen members as required by the act of incorporation. The Council shall consist of the officers enumerated in Article V hereof, the five most recent ex-presidents, and as many other members as necessary to complete the roster. At least one member of the Council shall be from the Pacific area. Vacancies in the Council shall be filled by the members thereof until the next annual meeting.

Section 2. The Council shall have power to suspend or expel members of the corporation for cause and to restore them to membership after a suspension of expulsion. No member shall be suspended or expelled without first having been given opportunity to be heard; but the Council shall strike from the roll of membership the name of any member who has failed to pay dues for three years, and thereafter such person shall cease to be a member of the corporation.

Section 3. The property of the corporation shall be vested in, and the affairs of the corporation conducted by, the Council.

Section 4. The Council shall have no power to bind the corporation to any expenditure of money beyond the actual resources of the corporation, except by the consent of every mem-

ber of the Council expressed in writing.

Section 5. The Council shall be charged with the general interests of the corporation including the election of members, the calling of meetings, and the auditing of the Treasurer's accounts.

ARTICLE V—OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the corporation shall be a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, an Assistant Secretary, a Treasurer and the Editor or Editors, who shall be elected by ballot for the term of one year at the annual meeting of the members. No President shall be elected to succeed himself.

Section 2. Vacancies in any office may be filled by the Council, if necessary by mail ballot.

ARTICLE VI—MEETINGS

Section 1. The annual meeting of the members of the corporation shall be held at such time in each year and at such place as shall be determined by the Society or by the Council. Notice thereof shall be sent by mail to each member not less than ten days prior to the meeting.

Section 2. Special meetings of the members may be called at any time by the Council and special meetings of the Council may be called by the President.

Section 3. Ten members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business by the corporation.

ARTICLE VII—SEAL

The seal of the corporation shall bear the name of the corporation in Latin, with the date of its foundation, together with an emblematic lamp, and the motto *Christiani nihil a me alienum puto*.

ARTICLE VIII—AMENDMENTS

This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds majority of those present and voting at any legally constituted annual meeting, provided that notice of such amendments shall have been given in writing at the preceding annual meeting, or the amendment itself shall have been approved by the Council.

BY-LAWS

ARTICLE I—FEES AND DUES

The annual dues for active members shall be Four Dollars; for sustaining members Ten Dollars. On payment of One Hundred Dollars at any one time, any individual member, not a library, may become a life member exempt from dues.

ARTICLE II—THE COUNCIL

Section 1. The Council shall meet in connection with each meeting of the Society, and at such other times as it may determine, for the transaction of business according to Section 5 of ARTICLE IV of the Constitution. Five members shall be a quorum.

Section 2. The Council may make such rules for its own action as it deems wise, provided these are not inconsistent with the Constitution or the By-Laws.

Section 3. The Council shall report to the Society at each of the Society's annual meetings, and at other meetings in its discretion, concerning essential actions of committees and business of importance transacted by it.

Section 4. The ex-presidents of the society who have retired from full membership in the Council shall be consulting members of the Council without voting privileges.

ARTICLE III—DUTIES OF OFFICERS

Section 1. The President, or in his absence the Vice-President, shall preside at every meeting of the Society. In the absence of these officers, the Society may choose a temporary President from among the members present.

Section 2. The Secretary shall keep the minutes, prepare the copy of the minutes of the Council and the Society and the program of the Pacific Coast area for the next issue of *Church History*, conduct the correspondence of the Society under the direction of the Council, preserve a permanent file of the publications of the Society, make arrangements for the meetings of the Society and shall be authorized to act as treasurer in the case of an emergency. The Assistant Secretary

shall perform any of the functions of the Secretary under his direction or in his absence.

Section 3. The Treasurer shall send bills for dues regularly to all members, have charge of the funds of the Society and disburse them under the direction of the Council, notify the members of each meeting by mail, as provided by the Constitution, and supervise the storage and marketing of publications of the Society other than the current issues of *Church History*.

ARTICLE IV—COMMITTEES

Section 1. The following committees shall be elected at each annual meeting of the Society to serve one year:

Program and Local Arrangements for the Annual Meeting,

Program and Local Arrangements for the Spring Meeting,

Program and Local Arrangements for the Pacific Coast Meeting,

Investment of Endowment Funds,

Membership,

Nominations,

Research, which shall isolate problems on which research is needed, stimulate preparation of various tools, source-books, texts, bibliographies, and further the location, collection and preservation of source materials,

Editorial, which shall be the Editorial Board for the quarterly *Church History* and shall have charge of other publications of the Society.

Section 2. These committees shall report to the Council which shall report their essential actions to the Society and present to the Society the nominations for all officers and committees.

Section 3. Vacancies in the committees shall be filled by the Council.

Section 4. The Council may appoint committees to report to itself.

ARTICLE V—PUBLICATIONS

Section 1. The quarterly *Church History* shall be sent to every member of the Society, except those who are in arrears for membership dues for the period of two issues.

Section 2. The income of the Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer endow-

ment fund shall be administered according to the following regulations:

A. It shall be used for printing such publications as may be ordered by the Society, preference being given to history books and pamphlets having to do with Congregational history. All prize essays shall have a suitable inscription recognizing the Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Fund.

B. The Brewer Prize shall be awarded only as often as \$1,000.00 shall have accumulated and the award of \$1,000.00 shall be given to assist publication. A limit of eighteen months shall be established within which a publication contract for the prize essay must have been completed. In the event that the recipient shall not have signed a contract within this period the funds shall revert to the Society. If at some later time the author arranges for publication he will be entitled to use the description "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History."

C. The jury of the Brewer Prize contest, consisting of three members of the Society named at the annual meeting preceding the contest, shall tentatively select a winning manuscript which then shall be submitted to the Editor. The final choice shall be made by at least the majority of the combined vote of the jury and the Editors.

D. The Council shall be empowered to make such changes in the conditions of the Brewer Contest as may seem necessary.

ARTICLE VI—PROCEDURE

Section 1. The order of business meetings of the Society, unless otherwise provided, shall be as follows:

Reading of the minutes of the previous meeting,

Report of the Council,

Reports of the officers and committees,

Unfinished business,

Election of officers and committees,

New business,

Adjournment.

Section 2. The procedure in business meetings, unless otherwise provided in the By-Laws, shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE VII—AMENDMENTS

The By-Laws may be amended at any duly constituted meeting of the Society by a majority vote of two-thirds of the members present and voting.

ACT OF INCORPORATION

LAW OF NEW YORK

CHAPTER 82

AN ACT

to incorporate the American Society of Church History, Incorporated. (Became a law March 30, 1916, with the approval of the Governor. Passed, three-fifths being present.)

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. John Alfred Faulkner, Edward Payson Johnson, William Walker Rockwell, Henry James Weber, Robert Hastings Nichols, Francis Albert Christie, Joseph Cullen Ayer, junior, James Isaac Good, David Schley Schaff, Henry Bradford Washburn, Frederick William Loetscher, James Coffin Stout, Austin B. Keep, William A. Schwarze, and George Edwin Herr and their successors in office chosen from time to time are hereby incorporated and are declared to be a body corporate of the state of New York by the name of the American Society of Church History, Incorporated, and by such name shall be known and shall have perpetual succession with the powers, limitations and restrictions herein contained.

Section 2. The objects of the corporation shall be to promote and stimulate historical study and research generally, but particularly in the department of church history; to discover, collect and preserve historical manuscripts; to print, publish and cause to be distributed, papers, books, writings, reports, articles and data bearing on or in anywise relating to church history or containing the re-

sults of the researches or other activities of its members; to establish and maintain traveling fellowships to carry out or to maintain any of the foregoing purposes; to hold conventions or meetings of its members; to establish and maintain a library; to establish and maintain endowments for any of the foregoing purposes; to acquire by purchase, gift, devise or otherwise, and to hold real and personal estate so far as may be necessary in carrying out its lawful purposes; and to mortgage, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of any real or personal estate according to law.

Section 3. The corporation hereby

created shall have all the powers and be subject to all the restrictions which now or hereafter may pertain by law to membership corporations in so far as the same are applicable to and not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

Section 4. The acts done by the above named persons on the twenty-seventh day of December, nineteen hundred and fifteen, in adopting by-laws, electing officers and passing resolutions so far as they are consistent with this act are hereby ratified and declared to be valid.

Section 5. This act shall take effect immediately.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

December 7, 1950 - November 30, 1951

I. CURRENT FUNDS

A. SUMMARY and BALANCE

Receipts

Balance on hand, December 6, 1950		\$ 888.25
Membership dues	\$2,085.69	
Income from CHURCH HISTORY	1,056.01	
<i>Studies</i> —see Schedule C	69.01	
		<hr/>
		3,210.71
		<hr/>
Total receipts		\$4,098.96

Disbursements

Expenses of management		\$ 862.94
Publication of CHURCH HISTORY		1,515.39
<i>Studies</i> —see Schedule C		63.00
		<hr/>
Total disbursements		\$2,441.33
Cash on hand, November 30, 1951		
Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co.		
checking account, Bank Statement	\$1,955.95	
Plus credit of deducted exchange		
cost of 4 Canadian checks	1.71	
		<hr/>
		\$1,957.66
		<hr/>
Less outstanding checks	300.03	1,657.63
		<hr/>
		\$4,098.96

B. GENERAL FUNDS and MAGAZINE

Receipts

Membership dues		
1948— 4 members	\$ 12.00	
1949— 5 members	15.00	
1950— 19 members	77.00	
1951—486 members	1,943.69	
1952— 9 members	38.00	
		<hr/>
		\$2,085.69
Subscriptions to CHURCH HISTORY (235)	\$ 913.44	
Sale of copies	142.57	
		<hr/>
		1,056.01
		<hr/>
		\$3,141.70

Disbursements

Management of Society		
Postage and express charges	\$ 122.05	
Printing and mimeographing	131.00	
Stationery and supplies	32.29	
Secretarial services		
Secretary	\$ 37.50	
Treasurer	241.75	279.25
		<hr/>
Safe deposit box	7.00	
Telegrams and telephone tolls	3.74	
Discount Canadian checks	1.30	
Travelling expenses for treasurer's books	7.24	
Bond of Treasurer	25.00	
Treasurer's Stipend	200.00	
Travelling expenses, Secretary	46.07	
		<hr/>
		\$ 854.94*

*Two returned checks of \$4.00 each not included in this sum.

Publication of CHURCH HISTORY

Printing and distribution of magazine	\$1,300.43	
Postage and express charges	28.87	
Telegrams and telephone tolls	1.43	
Stationery and supplies	7.50	
Discount Canadian check41	
Secretarial services		
Hartford Office	\$ 44.25	
Treasurer	112.50	156.75
		<hr/>
Expenses, Associate editor	12.00	
		<hr/>
		\$1,507.39*
		<hr/>
		\$2,362.33

*Two returned checks of \$4.00 each not included in this sum.

C. STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY

Receipts

Sales (including postage)

Volume III	\$ 2.47
Volume IV	12.99
Volume V	11.67
Volume VII	35.66
Monograph II	6.22
	<hr/>
	\$69.01

Disbursements

Volume III

Postage	\$.19
Stenographic services25
Settlement with author	1.63
Editorial services18
	<hr/>

\$ 2.25

Volume IV

Postage	\$.16
Stenographic services	1.75
Editorial services	1.01
Settlement with author	2.30
Publication Reserve	6.78
	<hr/>

12.00

Volume V

Postage	\$.36
Stenographic services	2.25
Editorial services84
To Publication Reserve	7.55
	<hr/>

11.00

Volume VII

Postage	\$ 3.15
Stenographic services	14.75
Editorial services	1.39
Publication Reserve	12.46
	<hr/>

31.75

Monograph II

Postage	\$.36
Stenographic services25
Editorial services54
Settlement with author	4.85
	<hr/>

6.00

\$63.00

II. COMPARATIVE STATEMENT—OPERATING ACCOUNT GENERAL FUNDS AND MAGAZINE

<i>Receipts</i>						
	1945-46	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51
General	\$1,543.89	\$1,418.29	\$1,429.44	\$1,535.06	\$2,003.25	\$2,085.69
Magazine	644.48	839.63	747.75	706.08	847.26	1,056.01
Totals	\$2,188.37	\$2,257.92	\$2,177.19	\$2,241.14	\$2,850.51	\$3,141.70
<i>Disbursements</i>						
General	\$ 506.38	\$ 592.76	\$ 658.35	\$ 779.09	\$ 721.43	\$ 862.94
Magazine	1,346.77	1,452.19	1,978.54	1,655.91	1,651.66	1,515.39
Totals	\$1,853.15	\$2,044.95	\$2,636.89	\$2,435.00	\$2,373.09	\$2,378.33
Operating deficit			459.70	193.86		
Operating surplus	335.22	212.97			477.42	763.37

III. ENDOWMENT FUND

A. CASH

<i>Receipts</i>	
Brought forward December 7, 1950	\$3,085.91
Interest, U. S. bonds	\$267.50
Interest, Manufacturers' Trust Co.	13.96
Principal, Manufacturers' Trust Co.	4.68
Interest, Auburn Savings Bank	30.39
	<hr/>
	316.53
Total	\$3,402.44
Cash in Western Savings Fund Society, Phila., November 30, 1951.	

Division of Endowment Fund Cash

Interest Brewer Prize Fund, \$10,000 2½% bond	\$1,639.06
Publication Reserve	1,028.30
General Endowment	735.08
	<hr/>
	\$3,402.44

B. SECURITIES, November 30, 1951

- \$ 952.97 guaranteed 1st mortgage certificate, N64, No. 207, of New York Title and Mortgage Company, in liquidation, Manufacturers' Trust Company, trustee.
- 10,000.00 registered U.S. Savings Bond, Series G, X1 066 817 G 2½%, 1962
- 500.00 registered U.S. Savings Bond, Series G, D3 382 226 G 2½%, 1962
- 100.00 registered U.S. Savings Bond, Series G, C5 711 912 G 2½%, 1962
- 100.00 registered U.S. Savings Bond, Series G, C5 711 913 G 2½%, 1962

These securities are in the Society's box in the Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Company, 135 South Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Guy S. Klett,
Treasurer

0-51
5.69
6.01

1.70

2.94
5.39

8.33

3.37

35.91

16.53

02.44

39.06
28.30
35.08

02.44

York
urers'

1962
1962
1962
1962
Trust

ett,
er